A MISSIONARY WISDOM GATTUNG:
IDENTIFICATION, SITZ IM LEBEN, HISTORY AND CONNECTIONS WITH THE NEW TESTAMENT

by

DOUGLAS MORRIS PARROTT

A dissertation presented to the faculty of the Graduate Theological Union in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

May, 1970

XUM

PREFACE

When available, and satisfactory, published English translations of ancient and modern languages have been used in this dissertation. In the case of translations from Coptic, Greek, and Hebrew, the texts in the original languages have been consulted. Where (in the case of Coptic) I have chosen to give my own translation, I have not given the original when the editio princeps is is available.

In instances where transcriptions and translations have not yet been published I have tried not to give direct translations in order to avoid premature publication of parts of other scholar's assignments. In a few places, however, such translations could not be avoided.

In all cases where I have translated from Coptic materials that are either unpublished or not readily available, I have provided the Coptic.

I have not followed the common practice of showing the Greek loan-words in translations from the Coptic. Although it may be of some help to the reader who knows Greek, assuming that the loan-word represents what was in the Greek original (if there was such), it is a practice that is not followed in any other language, so far as I know, and it may well be misleading, since it is quite possible that Copts translating from the Greek would have translated

un-familiar Greek words by familiar Greek loan-words. It is also possible that some Greek loan-words achieved a somewhat different meaning in their Coptic context than the one with which the Greek reader would be familiar. In any case, translations in which the Greek loan-words are shown are, or soon will be, available. (See Appendix I)

Translations from the Old Testament, Apocrypha, and the New Testament are uniformly those of the Revised Standard Version.

No periods have been used in the abbreviations of the names of ancient books and tractates because their omission presents no ambiguity to the reader.

The abbreviations of the names of the books and tractates that are, or that contain, the examples of our Gattung are given on p. 4 of this dissertation. Those of the gnostic tractates are the ones that have been adopted by the Institute for Antiquity and Christianity for use in its forthcoming publication of the Coptic gnostic library.

For abbreviations of the names of other Biblical, as well as Apocryphal books, I have used those in The Oxford Annotated Bible with The Apocrypha--Revised Standard Version, on p. xvi of the part entitled, The Holy Bible, and p. xxi of the part entitled, The Apocrypha.

For abbreviations of the names of ancient authors and works other than the above, and of journals and series, I have used where possible those found at the beginning of each of the four volumes of The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible.

The following is a list of abbreviations used here that are not found in either of the above mentioned sources. I have also included a few of the short titles that might present some difficulty of recognition.

ADAIK	Abhandlungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts Kairo
AGSJU	Arbeiten zur Geschichte des spätern Judentums und des Urchristentums
BG	The Coptic gnostic codex located in Berlin that has been edited (with the exception of the final tractate) in BG 8502, which see below.
BG 8502	W. C. Till, ed., Die gnostischen Schriften des koptischen Papyrus Berolinensis 8502, TU 60, Berlin: 1955.
CG	The Coptic gnostic codices discovered at Nag Hammadi circa 1945 and now located in Cairo.
CH	Corpus Hermeticum
EpiphPan	Epiphanius' Panarion
Eug	The Letter of Eugnostos (CG III,3 and CG V,1)
HNT	Handbuch zum Neuen Testament
Hennecke	W. Schneemelcher, ed., Edgar Hennecke: New Testament Apocrypha, English trans. edited by R. McL. Wilson, in two Vols.; Philadelphia: 1963-65.
IDB	The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, in four Volumes, New York: 1962.
JAC	Jahrbuch für Antique und Christentum
The Origins of Gnosticism	U. Bianchi, publisher, The Origins of Gnosticism, Colloquium of Messina 13-18 April, 1966, Texts and Discussions, Studies in the History of Religions (Supplements to Numen) XII, Leiden: 1967.
OxRSV	Herbert G. May and Bruce Metzger, ed., The Oxford Annotated Bible, The Holy Bible, Revised Standard Version, New York: 1962.

OxRSV Apoc	Bruce M. Metzger, ed., The Oxford Annotated Apocrypha, The Apocrypha of the Old Testament, Revised Standard Version, New York: 1965.
PW	Paulys-Wissowa, Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament

I wish to express my appreciation to the Institute for Antiquity and Christianity, and its director, Professor James M. Robinson, for making available to me indispensable unpublished materials. From Professor Robinson, also, came the initial suggestion that ultimately led to this dissertation.

Above all, I wish to thank my wife and children, who, in order that this work might be completed, gave up much that was rightfully theirs.

D. M. P.

May , 1970

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE ii

INTRODUCTION 1

CHAPTER I. EXAMPLES OF THE GATTUNG 4

Gattung Characteristics in the Examples (5)
The Recipients (5)--The Revealer (9)--The Revelation that is Given by the Divine Being (15)--Provision for the Transmission of the Revelation (22)
Sub-types of the Gattung (28)

CHAPTER II. THE SITZ IM LEBEN OF THE GATTUNG 32

Review of Previous Research (33)
Jewish Sub-type (33)--Christian Sub-type (33)--Neutral Sub-type (40)--Summary (44)
Elements of the Gattung Compared with Elements in Jewish Wisdom Literature (44)
The Figure of the Revealer (46)
Divine Wisdom in Jewish Wisdom Literature (46)--Comparison with Revealers in Examples of Gattung (51)
The Approach to the Revealer (61)
Approaches in Jewish Wisdom Literature (61)--Comparison with Approaches in Examples of Gattung (62)
Summary (65)
Conclusion (65)

CHAPTER III. HISTORY OF THE GATTUNG 70

The Relationship between Wisdom and Apocalyptic (70)
No Relationship (70)--Apocalyptic Roots in Wisdom--G. Von Rad (71)--Criticisms of Von Rad's View(77)--Summary (81)
Historical Connection Among Sub-types (81)
The Provenance of Daniel (82)
The Hasidim--A Movement (83)
Hypothetical Model of Historical Connections (92)
Palestinian-Jewish Trunk (93)--Egyptian Branch (94)--Christian Secondary Branch (98)--Philosophically-Authority Oriented Pagan Branch (99)--Later Development (100)
Summary (101)

CHAPTER IV. CONNECTIONS BETWEEN THE GATTUNG AND THE NEW TESTAMENT . 102

Passages in the Gospels and Acts (102)
Mark 13,3-27 (103)--Acts 1,6-11 and Matt 28,16-20 (106)
Revelation 1,8-3,22 (107)--Summary (109)

CONCLUSION 111

APPENDIX I. DATES, PRINCIPAL EDITIONS AND TRANSLATIONS OF GATTUNG EXAMPLES 112

APPENDIX II 123

BIBLIOGRAPHY 125

INTRODUCTION

This work is essentially an identification of a previously unrecognized[1] Gattung[2] and the tracing of its history. It is found in documents from Daniel to Pistis Sophia and beyond.

Purely descriptively, it appears as follows: A person, or persons, with usually some special preparation and/or character, receives a revelation from a divine being. This revelation is characterized by the fact that it encompasses great spans of time (past, present and future) and vast historical or cosmological events, that it is presented without visions, dreams, or any modes of expression that could be considered deliberately cryptic or enigmatic, and that it often contains dialogue as well as discourse. Those who receive the revelation are expected to convey it to a larger number.

The focal point of the Gattung is the revelation. It is that which the person or persons seek, that which is brought by the divine

---

[1] Norman R. Petersen has perhaps come closest to recognizing this Gattung. In his doctoral dissertation, The Literary Problematic of the Apocryphon of John (Harvard dissertation: 1967), p. 138, he describes the Gattung of the Apocryphon of John (one of our examples) in this fashion: "The visionary introduction, the message of the revealer, the subsequent dialogue between the visionary and the revealer, and, finally, the departure of the revealer after his final words to keep the document secret except for the elect in-group."

[2] By "Gattung" I mean "literary type," as described by Klaus Koch in his The Growth of the Biblical Tradition: The Form-Critical Method, trans. by S. M. Cupitt (2nd ed.; New York: 1969), pp. 3-5. It is to be distinguished from "form" only by the fact that it is a larger unit. No judgment is made as to whether this Gattung had a pre-literary stage, or existed at times in its history in an oral rather than in a written form.

being, and that which is to be transmitted to others.

What designation we are to give to it is not clear. It is, of course, a "revelation," since the revelation is the focal point, as we have just noted. Thus, it could be called "apocalyptic." Counting against this, however, is the fact that "apocalyptic" is freighted with meanings of a very specific nature that make it inappropriate for use when referring to many of the examples of our Gattung (particularly the ones we think of as gnostic.)[1] But if we remove the freight by using "revelation" instead, we must deal with the fact that there are various kinds of revelations. Which one is this? Festugiere identifies four types of direct revelation: Revelation in the course of a dream or ecstasy; Revelation received in the course of a conversation with a god; Revelation by discovery of a book or a stele; Revelation received by means of signs in the heaven.[2]

Our Gattung seems to belong to the second type. But some of the examples could be related to the first kind. However, even if our Gattung could be fitted neatly into one of Festugière's categories we would not have gotten very far, because, as we shall see, it has special characteristics that call for more precise definition.

For a specific designation we will have to wait until we can achieve some understanding of this Gattung's Sitz im Leben, i.e., the

---

[1] See D. S. Russell, The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic (Philadelphia: 1964), pp. 105-106; also, Hennecke, Vol. II, pp. 582-587.

[2] Le R. P. Festugière, O.P., La Révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste, Vol. I: L'Astrologie et Les Sciences Occultes (3rd ed.; Paris: 1950), pp. 309-345.

situation in life in which this form played its role. In the meantime we will have to content ourselves with the use of the demonstrative "this" and the pronoun "our."

Since this Gattung is dealt with here for the first time, it would be of little value to try to write the usual first dissertation chapter reviewing the scholarship of the past. I have chosen rather to present the previous work that sheds some light on our Gattung in those places in the course of the development of the thesis where they can contribute the most to our understanding.

The first chapter, then, will be concerned with the identification of examples of the Gattung, and the differentiation of three sub-types: Jewish, Christian, and Neutral. The second will take up the problem of the Sitz im Leben, and will contend that it is in the missionary activity of those interested in wisdom. The third will attempt to trace the history that the first two chapters suggest. In the fourth and final chapter some suggestions will be made about the possible connection between this form and the New Testament.

CHAPTER I

EXAMPLES OF THE Gattung

The books and parts of books, tractates and parts of tractates, that are examples of the Gattung that I have described in a summary fashion in the Introduction are the following:[1] Daniel (Dan) 10-12; Jubilees (Jub); The Apocalypse of Baruch (ApocalBar) 21-32,6; The First Apocalypse of James (1 ApocJas), 30,14-38,10; The Sophia of Jesus Christ (SJC); The Apocryphon of John (ApocryJn); The Letter of Peter to Philip (PetPhil), 133,13-139,5; Pistis Sophia, Books I-III (PSoph); the Kasr Al-Wizz document;[2] The Nature of the Archons (NatArch) 92,18-97,21; The Paraphrase of Shem (ParaShem); Poimandres (Poim). The Gospel of Mary (GMary) 1,1-9,5 will also be mentioned occasionally, because even though much of it is missing, the part

---

[1] Information on the dates and the principal editions (where they exist) of the examples will be found at the end of this dissertation in Appendix I.

[2] Similar to the Kasr Al-Wizz document are the two tractates published in C. Detlef G. Müller, ed. Die Bücher der Einsetzung der Erzengel Michael und Gabriel, Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium, Vol. 225 and 226, Scriptores Coptici, Tomus 31 and 32, Louvain: 1962. A brief description of each is found in Vol. 226, p. vi. In each Jesus gives the revelation to his disciples. In each the time is after the resurrection. In each there is a commission. (71,8 and 99,22 of translation) The significant similarity between these and the Kasr Al-Wizz document is that the cosmological revelation is summarized at the beginning, and other matters are given the bulk of the attention. Possible dates for the origin of the first are the fourth through the sixth centuries A.D. For the second all that can be said is that it originated before the ninth century. (Vol. 226, pp. vi-vii)

that remains exhibits signs of our Gattung.[1]

Rather than describing each example separately, which, I suspect, could draw out this chapter beyond the endurance of the reader, I will take the characteristics of the Gattung and show how, in varying ways, each example exhibits them. In the few instances of exceptions, I will attempt to explain the reason for them.

Gattung Characteristics in the Examples

The Recipients

The recipient or recipients of the revelation, have some special character and/or preparation.

In Dan, the one who receives the revelation is, of course, Daniel himself. According to the writer of the book, Daniel was a pious Jew of the time of the Babylonian Captivity (1,1-8), who was given wisdom by God (2,27-30), and was thus able to reveal and interpret dreams for kings (Chapters 1, 2, and 4), and read and interpret cryptic writing (Chapter 5). In 10,2 Daniel tells us that he prepared himself for the revelation in the following way: ". . . I, Daniel, was mourning for three weeks. I ate no delicacies, no meat or wine entered my mouth, nor did I anoint myself at all, for the full three weeks."

In Jub the recipient is Moses. No preparation is mentioned.

In the ApocalBar, the recipient is Baruch, the companion and

---

[1] The close connection assumed here between Apocalypticism, Gnosticism and Hermetism was noted, perhaps first, in D. Wilhelm Bousset and Hugo Gressmann, Die Religion des Judentums in spathellenistischen Zeitalter, HNT 21 (4th ed.; Tübingen: 1966), pp. 521-22. See Appendix II for quotation.

secretary of Jeremiah the prophet. Before the revelation occurs we read: "And I went and sat in the valley of Cedron in a cave of the earth, and I sanctified my soul there, and I ate no bread, yet I was not hungry, and I drank no water, yet I thirsted not, and I was there till the seventh day . . ." (21,1)

In 1 ApocJas, James, the brother of the Lord (24,13), receives the revelation. He prepares himself by prayer. (30,28-31,1)

In SJC, the recipients are the twelve disciples and seven women. No preparation is mentioned. (77,11-13)

In ApocryJn, the one who receives the revelation is John the disciple, one of the sons of Zebedee. (19,8-9) No preparation is mentioned.

In PetPhil it is Peter and Philip and other (unnumbered and un-named) apostles who receive the revelation. They prepare themselves by prayer. (133,18-134,9)

In PSoph it is the disciples, including also women, as in SJC. Here, however, no numbers are given. There is no personal spiritual preparation, such as prayer or fasting. However, the eleven years of post-resurrection teaching are an obvious kind of preparation.

In the Kasr Al-Wizz document the recipients are the apostles of Christ. The only one specifically named is Peter. (3,6-7 and 6,7) No preparation is mentioned.

In GMary, the revelation is apparently received by all the disciples, plus Mary. We cannot be sure because the first six pages of the tractate are missing.

In NatArch the recipient is Norea. There are a variety of

accounts and conjectures about who she was and where the name came from. Irenaeus in IrenHer I,30,9 says that in the teachings of the Sethians and the Ophites she was considered the daughter of Adam and the wife of Seth, and therefore all men came from her. Epiphanius in EpiphPan II 26,1,4-8 says that the Gnostics, who were also called the Borborites, considered her to be Noah's wife. She burned the ark three times because she was not permitted to enter it. Epiphanius says that the name comes from the Aramaic נוֹרָא, meaning "fire," and that the whole story comes originally from the Greek flood myth. Modern scholars have brought forth other ideas about the meaning and origin of the word.[1] No view has achieved general acceptance. In NatArch as a whole the Sethian-Ophite and the Gnostic ideas about her have been brought together as a result of the welding of the account that we are interested in onto a document that is a gnostic commentary on the early parts of Genesis.[2] In our section the revealer says to Norea, "You and your sons belong to the Father who is from the beginning." (96,19-20)[3] This sounds like the Norea of the Irenaeus account. (Whereas in 92,3-17 she burns the ark that would have saved man from being wiped out completely by the evil Archons, and Noah is

---

[1] An excellent review of all the information and conjectures about the name of Norea is found in Roger Bullard, The Hypostasis of the Archons (Vanderbilt University dissertation: 1965), pp. 166-174.

[2] Based upon R. Bullard's suggestion, Ibid., p. 179. He believes that the seam may be at 92,32. I prefer 92,18, because that is where the account of the burning of the arks breaks off. If Epiphanius is correct we would expect to find a total of three burnings. In our text there is only one.

[3] ⲛ̄ⲧⲟ ⲙ̄ⲙⲛ̄ ⲛⲟⲩⲥⲩⲏⲣⲉ ⲉⲣⲉⲏⲙ̄ ⲁⲡⲉⲓⲱⲧ ⲉⲧⲥⲩⲟⲟⲛ ϧⲓⲛ ⲛ̄ⲥⲩⲏⲣⲉ. N.B. ⲛⲟⲩⲥⲩⲏⲣⲉ could also be "their sons."

forced to make another, all of which sounds like the Epiphanius account.) This means that in the section that displays our Gattung Norea would seem to be a kind of representative figure. That she would be representative of all mankind, as the section in Irenaeus says, seems doubtful in the light of NatArch 96,27-29. There we learn that the seed that will be immortal in the midst of mortal man (i.e., Norea's sons) will not appear at the time of the revelation, but will appear after three generations. Thus in our section of NatArch Norea is representative of a certain group among the race of mankind.

No preparation is mentioned for the revelation.

In the ParaShem the recipient is Sēem. He may be the son of Noah, but his identification as "the first being upon the earth" (1, 20-21)[1] makes it seem unlikely.[2] The preparation for the revelation is a kind of trance-like experience in which his understanding separates him from the rest of men and takes him to the top of creation. (1,6-9)

In Poim the recipient is not identified by name. CH XIII,15 refers to a teaching that Hermes received from Poimandres, and it might seem reasonable therefore to think that this refers to Poim, since it is only there that Poimandres appears in the CH. The recipient in Poim, then, would be Hermes. But against this we must ask why Hermes is not identified as the recipient in Poim itself.

---

1 ⲡⲁⲩⲣⲡ ⲛⲁⲩⲱⲛⲉ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲡⲁⲁⲩ

[2] See the material on Shem gathered by J. Doresse, The Secret Books of the Egyptian Gnostics (New York: 1960), pp. 154-55. He assumes that Sēem and the Biblical Shem are the same.

Pending an answer to that question the problem of the name of the recipient will remain unresolved.

His preparation for the revelation is an experience similar to that in ParaShem, and is described thus: "One day, when I had begun to reflect upon the things that truly exist and my thoughts had soared aloft, while my bodily senses were bridled like those borne down by sleep through surfeit of food or fatigue of the body . . ." (1)

The Revealer

The revealer in each case is clearly a divine figure.

Daniel, after his preparation, sees on the bank of the great river[1] "a man clothed in linen, whose loins were girded with gold of Uphaz. His body was like beryl, his face like the appearance of lightning, his eyes like flaming torches, his arms and legs like the gleam of burnished bronze, and the sound of his words like the noise of a multitude." (10:5-7)

The name of this person is not given. If, as some scholars think, this is Gabriel,[2] then it is hard to understand why Daniel, who had seen him twice before (8,16-17 and 9,21) was at first overcome

---

[1] James A. Montgomery, The Book of Daniel, ICC (Edinburgh: 1927), p. 407, notes that in all other places in the OT "the great river" refers to the Euphrates. Only here does the text add, "which is the Tigris." He suggests that this latter phrase should be considered an early gloss. This is an attractive idea because without the identification with the Tigris Daniel would be facing west, i.e., in the direction of Jerusalem, and his position would have symbolic value, which it does not seem to have with the MT as it stands.

[2] Montgomery, Ibid., p. 420; Arthur Jeffrey, in OxRSV, p. 1083; J. Barr in Peake's Commentary, sec. 527c.

(10,8-9), and why only this third time the appearance of Gabriel is described, but his name is not given. It seems likely therefore that this is not Gabriel.

There are two clues about his identity found in our text. In 10,21 he tells Daniel that he will tell him what is inscribed in the book of truth. There is an obvious similarity[1] between this book and the Heavenly Tablets of Enoch 81,1, as well as the tablets used by the angel of the presence in Jub 1,29. This means that the revealer in Dan was privy to heavenly knowledge about the past, present and future.

The other clue is found in 10,20-21.[2] There he says that he is going to fight against first the prince of Persia and then the prince of Greece. As Montgomery shows, these "princes" are really patron angels--part of the heavenly hierarchy.[3] Does that mean that the revealer is the patron angel of Israel? No, because we are told that Israel's prince is Michael. But when the revealer fights, it is Michael, and he alone, who fights at his side. This suggests that the revealer has wider interests than the fate of any one nation, but that, at least at this point, his interests coincide with the interests of Israel. In heavenly rank, then, we would put him above the patron angels. But how far above is not clear.

---

[1] Noted by Montgomery, The Book of Daniel, p. 418.

[2] The serious problem of the ordering of the parts of these verses has been dealt with by Montgomery, Ibid., p. 416. Our conclusions, however, are not affected by any re-ordering of the parts of these verses.

[3] Montgomery, Ibid., pp. 419-20.

In Jub there are two revealers. Moses is given brief instructions by God himself in the first chapter. But most of the book, beginning at 1,27, is devoted to a revelation given by an angel of the presence. Moses does not see God, but does see his Glory, which is described as like "a flaming fire on the top of the mount." (1,3) The appearance of the angel of the presence is not described. Angels of the presence are said in 2,2 to have been created on the first day, and in 2,18 we learn that they are one of the two classes of angels that God bid keep the Sabbath with him in heaven and on earth. Charles traces the idea of angels of the presence to Is 63,9. ("In all their affliction he was afflicted, and the angel of his presence saved them.")[1] Of more significance in understanding these angels in the context of Jub is the reference to them found in the Qumran "The Liturgy of the Angels." "[. . . the angels that minister] to the Presence of God's Glory in that compartment of heaven where abide [the beings who possess (true)] knowledge."[2] It is apparent from this that the word "presence" refers to God's presence.

In ApocalBar it is God himself who addresses Baruch. (23,1) Although Baruch apparently does not see God, we learn that he does see his glory. In 21,25 Baruch asks that God show his glory quickly, and

---

[1] Charles, Pseudepigrapha, II, 13.

[2] The translation is Theodor H. Gaster's in his The Dead Sea Scriptures (revised and enlarged ed.; Garden City: 1964), p. 372. The first set of brackets is mine. The photograph in the editio princeps makes it clear that it is necessary. The editio princeps is J. Strugnell, "The Angelic Liturgy at Qumran-4Q Serek Sirot 'Olat Hassabbat," Congress Volume, Supplements to VT, VII (Leiden: 1960), 318-45. The transcription by Strugnell (p. 336) is as follows:

... משׁ[לחת כנ]י הכבוד במשׁכ[ן אוֹ]ר לעת (4Q Sl 40 24 2)

two verses later we are told that the heavens were opened and Baruch saw. (22,1)

In 1 ApocJas the revealer is the resurrected Jesus. However, nothing is made of his appearance, except that he is flesh and blood, since James is able to embrace and kiss him. (31,4)

SJC has the resurrected Jesus as the revealer, and describes him in this way:

> Now the Savior appeared to them, not in his first form, but with the invisible spirit. And his form was the form of a great angel of light. And his likeness I must not describe. Mortal flesh cannot bear it, but only pure (and) perfect flesh. (78,11-79,5)

In ApocryJn the revealer identifies himself when he first appears as the Father, the Mother, and the Son. (21,20-1) Toward the end of the revelation, however, John calls him "Christ." (58,2 et al) His initial appearance is striking, but also confusing. In the context of great light (20,20-21), John sees first a child, then an elder, then a multiplicity of forms that interpenetrate each other in a unity. And at the end of this initial experience, he sees three forms in the unity. (21,3-13)

From the trinitarian self-identification statement it would seem that the revealer here is not simply Christ, but the whole Godhead.[1]

---

[1] Giverson points out the close connection between this self-identification statement and the trinitarian formula in Mt 28,19. The parallel is striking because the preceding phrase in ApocryJn ("I am the one who is with you always") is so similar to Mt 28,20. S. Giversen, Ed. and trans., Apocryphon Johannis. The Coptic Text of the Apocryphon Johannis in the Nag Hammadi Codex II with Translation, Introduction and Commentary, Acta Theologica Danica 5 (Copenhagen: 1963), pp. 156-57. The substitution of "mother" for "spirit" could have occurred in a milieu where the word for "spirit" was feminine.

In PetPhil the revealer appears as a great light, and a voice speaks out of it identifying itself as Jesus Christ. (134,9)

In PSoph the revealer is Jesus. Here the light motif appears once more, but with greater intensity. When he returns from his ascension (after teaching the disciples and the women for eleven years following the resurrection), he is described thus:

> ". . . they saw Jesus descend, shining very bright, and the light in which he was was beyond measure. For he shone more than at the hour when he ascended up to the heavens, so that the men in the world could not describe the light that was upon him, and it sent forth many beams of light, and its beams were beyond number, and its light was not like one to the other, but it was of different kind and of different form, since some (beams) surpassed the others countless times. . ."[1]

In the Kasr Al-Wizz document the revealer is the resurrected Jesus "four days before he was taken up to heaven." (2,11-3,4)[2] No description is given of his appearance.

In GMary, it is again the resurrected Jesus. (9,9-11) Apparently the revelation is given on the very day of his departure into heaven. (9,5) No description of his appearance remains.

In NatArch the revealer is an angel who identifies himself thus: "I am Eleleth, the Wisdom, the great angel, the one who stands in the presence of the Holy Spirit." (93,8-10)[3] He is one of the four luminaries that stand before the great, invisible spirit. (93, 20-22) Of his appearance Norea speaks: "I will not be able to tell

---

[1] Hennecke, Vol. I, 255. (Schmidt: 7,7-18)

2 ϩⲁⲑⲛ ⲛ̄ⲩⲧⲟⲟⲩ ⲛ̄ϩⲟⲟⲩ ⲙ̄ⲡⲁⲧⲟⲩⲁⲛⲁⲗⲁⲙⲃⲁⲛⲉ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲩ ϩⲛ̄ ⲙ̄ⲡⲛⲩⲉ

3 ⲁⲛⲟⲕ ⲡⲉ ⲉⲗⲉⲗⲏⲑ ⲧⲙ̄ⲛ̄ⲧⲥⲁⲃⲉ ⲡⲛⲟⲩ̄ ⲛ̄ⲁⲅⲅⲉⲗⲟⲥ ⲡⲉⲧⲁϩ ⲉⲣⲁⲧⲩ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲙⲧⲟ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲙ̄ⲡⲛ̄ⲛ̄ⲁ ⲉⲧⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ

of his power, his likeness as precious gold, his raiment as the snow, for my mouth will not bear to speak of his power and the likeness of his face." (93,14-17)[1] In ApocryJn Eleleth is the fourth of the four great Lights that appeared from the self-begotten God, and that stood before him. (33,1-4) Eleleth was set over the fourth aeon, which encompasses three aeons: perfection, peace and wisdom. (34, 2-7) Giversen following W. W. Harvey believes that the name may have come from the Hebrew meaning "to shine."[2] It seems to me more likely that it comes from the Coptic ⲉⲗⲉⲗ meaning "brightness," with a magical suffix added.[3]

The revealer in ParaShem is identified as Derdekeas. He does not appear, but is present in voice only. (1,16-17). He describes himself as "the son of the undefiled, infinite Light." (4, 2-3)[4] He comes in the form of spirit (4,5), and is furthermore, the ray of the universal Light, and its appearance. (4,6-7)

---

1 ⲧⲛⲁⲯⲭⲱ ⲁⲛ ⲛⲧⲉⲩⲟⲟⲙ ⲡⲉⲩⲉⲓⲛⲉ ⲛ̄ⲑⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲃ ⲉⲧⲥⲟⲧⲡ ⲁⲧⲱ ⲧⲉⲩϩⲃⲥⲱ ⲛ̄ⲑⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲭⲓⲱⲛ ⲧⲁⲧⲁⲡⲣⲟ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲛⲁⲯⲟⲩⲟⲡϥ ⲁⲛ ⲉⲧⲣⲁⲭⲱ ⲛⲧⲉⲩⲟⲟⲙ ⲙ̄ⲙⲛ ⲡⲉⲓⲛⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲩϩⲟ

2 S. Giversen, ed. and trans., Apocryphon Johannis, Acta Theologica Danica 5 (Copenhagen: 1963), p. 185. For a full discussion of the four great lights, where the similarity is noted between them and the four great angels about the throne of God in post-exilic Jewish tradition, see R. M. Grant, Gnosticism and Early Christianity (Revised ed.; New York: 1966), pp. 42-46.

3 For the Coptic word see under ⲉⲓⲉⲗⲉⲗ in Crum's Coptic Dictionary. For the suffix see Campbell Bonner, Studies in Magical Amulets--Chiefly Graeco-Egyptian (Ann Arbor: 1950), pp. 197-98. On the latter page occurs this formula: Ιω ερβηθ ιω ιαωερβηθ ιω βολχοσηθ. See also Gershom G. Scholem, Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism and Talmudic Tradition (New York: 1960), p. 71, note 23. Giversen's suggestion is weak because it results in a name with a feminine form. Eleleth is a male.

4 ⲡⲱⲏⲣⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓⲛ ⲛ̄ⲛⲁⲧⲭⲱϩⲙ ⲉⲧⲉ ⲙ̄ⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲩ ⲁⲣⲏϫ̄ϥ̄

Of the name, Doresse conjectures that it may have developed from the Aramaic DRDG, meaning "to fall in droplets." He refers to BG 8502, 103,13 where droplets are mentioned (although of course in Coptic).[1] I find myself agreeing with George Widengren's comment on this idea: "L'étymologie proposée ne s'impose pas."[2]

In Poim the revealer is described as "a being of vast, immeasurable size." (1) This being identifies himself as follows: "I am Poimandres, the Mind of the Absolute Sovereignty." (2) The name is probably intentionally mysterious, although some have attempted to make out of it "the Knowledge of Ra," or "Shepherd of men," or "Shepherd."[3]

The Revelation that is Given by the Divine Being

What gives our Gattung its special distinctiveness is the revelation that is given by the divine being. As I have said in the Introduction, it is characterized by the fact that it encompasses great spans of time (past, present and future) and vast historical

---

[1] J. Doresse, The Secret Books, p. 147, n. 1.

[2] G. Widengren, "Les origines du gnosticisme et l'histoire des religions," The Origins of Gnosticism, pp. 58-59.

[3] For C. H. Dodd's opinion (the first listed above), and a review of the question, see his The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel (Cambridge: 1953), p. 30. E. Haenchen prefers "Hirtenmann," in his "Aufbau und Theologie des 'Poimandres,'" ZThK, 53 (1956), 152. Festugière gives no opinion of his own on this question but refers the reader to R. Marcus, "The Name 'Poimandres'," JNES, VIII (1949), 40-43. (La Révélation, Vol. I, 440) Marcus reviews the suggestions that had been made to that time and proposes ΠΕΙΜΕ ΝΤΜΝΤΕΡΟ , meaning "The reason of sovereignty." Through haplophony he believes that the word could have become peimentro, and then been Hellenized to Poimandres.

or cosmological events, that it is presented without visions, dreams, or any modes of expression that could be considered deliberately cryptic or enigmatic, and that it often contains dialogue as well as discourse. In the descriptions that follow I will concentrate on the first characteristic, and mention the second and the third only when there is an exception to them. Also, I will not go into the question of possible sources, since our concern is how the revelations appear in their present context.

The revelation in Dan is a prediction of the future and begins with the time in which Daniel was presumed to have lived--the time of Cyrus--and moves through the time of the Persian Empire, Alexander the Great, the establishment of the Ptolemaic and Seleucid Empires, and then, with ever greater detail, through the time when Antiochus Epiphanies attempted to destroy the Jewish religion (11,30-39), to the final time of troubles and the general resurrection. (12,1-3)

Jub covers the events set forth in Genesis 1 to Exodus 12, with additions of both Halakic and Haggadic traditions. The revealer knows the precise date of events, and knows how the calendar should be arranged. (6,23-38) Within the revelation by the angel of the presence is found a short, more traditionally "apocalyptic," section in which a period of great sinfulness is predicted, followed by a golden age of 1000 years. (23,11-31) There is no dialogue in Jub. We will suggest a reason for this in the next chapter.

In ApocalBar the revelation is of the twelve divisions of time that will precede the establishment of the Messianic age, following which there will be a resurrection of the souls of the righteous. (27-30)

XUM

In 1 ApocJas the revelation is given in the form of a catechism, i.e., a question and answer examination that James will have to undergo when confronted by the Archons. (32,29-38,10) The Lord gives him the answers that will save him. In the course of the presentation the background of cosmological events becomes clear. James is from the Father--the Father who is pre-existent. According to a restoration made by Schenke, based upon IrenHer I,21,5, he was sent to the earth in order that he might see "the things that are ours and those that are alien." (33,24-28)[1] The things that are alien are not so entirely, but come from Achamoth (Heb for Sophia) who comes from the Pre-existent One. But they were created by her without His assistance. (34,2-15) James is going to return whence he came. (34,15-18) The mother of the three detainers (presumably Archons) is Achamoth who had no father. She only had a mother, "Sophia who is with the Father." (35,7) Achamoth produced the detainers without the aid of a male. (35,13-14)

In SJC the general description of the contents of the revelation is provided by the statement at the beginning of the tractate of the things which the disciples want to know about: "The substance of all things, the plan, the holy providence, the excellence of the powers, everything that the Saviour does there with them, the mysteries of the holy plan." (78,3-10) The revelation begins by stating the opinions of the philosophers about the ordering of the cosmos, with which the revelation is contrasted (80,12-81,12). Beginning with the "Boundless One" (83,15), the origin, development, and ordering

---

[1] H. M. Schenke, Review article, OLZ, LXI (1966), col. 28.

of all super-celestial, celestial, and mundane spheres is set forth.[1] This includes man (119,5-120,6), and his salvation. (122,5-124,9)

In ApocryJn the general trend of the revelation is suggested again by the things that concern John: "How was the Saviour chosen? Why was he sent from his Father into the world? Who is the Father who sent him? What is the nature of the Aeon to which we shall go?" (20,8-14) The revelation extends from 22,17-to 76,15. The revealer begins with a description of the highest and purest divinity and explains how, from it, the realms of the divine are created and inhabited. As a result of the illicit desire of one of these beings (Sophia), the being Ialdabaoth is created, who is at once ignorant, arrogant, and powerful. He creates a host of beings under him, who, in turn, create man. But man is given a portion of the divine nature, which Ialdabaoth desires to possess. To help man the Epinoia of light and Christ are sent, so that man might receive the spirit of life and in the end find true life in the realm of pure divinity.

In PetPhil the trend of the revelation is also given by the questions that the recipients express before the revelation begins. (134,9-18) The revelation extends from 135,5 to 137,13, and deals first with the origin of the cosmic powers, material existence, and human physical life (135,5-136,15), all stemming from the disobenience

---

[1] Although the general movement of thought in SJC is clear, there are nonetheless serious problems in fathoming some parts and one cannot help agreeing with Till when he says, "leidet die Klarheit und Verständlichkeit des Gesagten sehr oft erheblich dadurch, dass nicht einwandfrei deutlich wird, von wem die Rede ist, wer mit dem Pronomen oder der Bezeichnung gemeint ist, zumal sich die Wesenheiten öfter verdoppeln und die neuen Wesen gleich benannt werden." W. C. Till, ed., Die gnostischen Schriften des koptischen Papyrus Berolinensis 8502, TU 60 (Berlin: 1955), p. 56.

of the mother. (135,9-14) Then we learn of the appearance and mission of the Saviour (136,16-21), the special situation of those who belong to Christ, and their role (136,22-137,9), and the reason for the opposition of the powers. (137,10-13)

In PSoph the point of departure for the revelation is again provided by the questions of the disciples: "Rabbi, whither didst thou go, or what is thy service to which thou didst go, or why rather were all these upheavals and earthquakes which have taken place?"[1] The revelation is briefly characterized by Puech in the following way:

> Jesus begins by relating the journey which He has just accomplished through the aeons, in the course of which He has met Pistis Sophia "quite alone," "distressed and mourning," "beneath the thirteenth aeon." At the request of Mary He recounts at length the adventures and the lamentations of this being who has fallen from the thirteenth aeon into matter, and whom He has finally restored to her original abode. Then follows a dialogue on other themes: the mysteries of light, especially the most sublime among them, those of the Ineffable and of the first mystery; the origin of sin and evil in the world of men; the necessity of repentance; the punishments which await the sinner after death.[2]

In the Kasr Al-Wizz document, the first part of the revelation is merely summarized: "He told them of the incomprehensible mysteries, those in the heavens, and those on the earth; and of the way in which he will judge the living and the dead; and (of) the resurrection of the dead." (3,7-4,7)[3] However that portion of the revelation that is given in detail concerns "the mystery of the cross." (8,7-9) Peter's

---

[1] Translation from Hennecke, Vol. I, 255-56. (Schmidt: 8,18-21)

[2] In Hennecke, Vol. I, p. 256.

[3] ⲁⲩⲭⲱ ⲉⲣⲟⲟⲩ ⲛ̄ⲙ̄ⲙⲩⲥⲧⲏⲣⲓⲟⲛ ⲛ̄ⲁⲧⲧⲁϩⲟⲟⲩ· ⲛⲉⲧϩⲛ̄ ⲙ̄ⲡⲏⲩⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛⲉⲧϩⲓⲭⲙ̄ ⲡⲕⲁϩ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲙ̄ⲛ̄ⲑⲉ ⲉⲧⲉ ⲫⲛⲁⲕⲣⲓⲛⲉ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲧⲟⲛϩ̄ ⲙ̄ⲛ̄ ⲛⲉⲧⲙⲟⲟⲧⲧ·

question is: "Why will you bring it (the cross) with you in the day when you will judge in righteousness." (8,9-9,3)[1] Then follows a discussion of the role that the cross will play in the last judgment. (10,1-19,3)

In GMary the revelation is almost entirely on the missing pages 1-6. Only very tentative suggestions can be made from the little that remains. The first line reads: "Will, then, matter be [saved] or not?"[2] Had there earlier been a discussion about salvation, and/or about matter? Later Peter says: "Since you have told us about everything . . ." (7,10-12) Does this mean that the revelation had dealt with great spans of time or vast cosmological events? We can suspect that the answer is affirmative in each case because of the character of the two tractates that follow this one in BG 8502 (ApocJn and SJC), but there is no way to arrive at assurance short of finding the missing pages, or some ancient account of their contents.

In NatArch, the revelation given by Eleleth, which follows the initial words of assurance to the threatened Norea, is initiated also by thematic questions from Norea: "Lord, teach me about the [origin of] these powers, how they came to be, and from what nature, [and] from what material, [and] who made them and their power." (93, 34-94,2)[3] Eleleth then describes how the archons, beginning with

---

[1] ⲉⲃⲉ ⲟⲩ ⲉⲕⲛⲁⲛⲧⲩ ⲛⲙⲙⲁⲕ ⲉⲙ ⲡⲉⲥⲟⲟⲩ ⲉⲧⲙⲛⲁⲕⲣⲓⲛⲉ ⲉⲛ ⲧⲁⲓⲕⲁⲓⲟⲥⲩⲛⲏ

[2] ⲑ[ⲩ]ⲗⲏ ⲥⲉ ⲛⲁⲟⲩ[ⲭⲁ]! ⲭⲛ ⲙⲙⲟⲛ

[3] ⲡⲭⲟⲉⲓⲥ ⲙⲁⲧⲥⲃⲉⲉⲓ ⲁⲧ[ⲁⲣⲭⲏ ⲛⲛ]ⲉⲉⲓⲉⲝⲟⲩⲥⲓⲁ ⲭⲉ ⲛⲧⲁⲩⲱⲡⲉ [ⲛⲁⲩ ⲛⲥⲉ] ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲥⲛ ⲁⲩ ⲛⲥⲩⲡⲟⲥⲧ[ⲁⲥⲓⲥ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉ]ⲃⲟⲗ ⲥⲛ ⲁⲩ ⲛⲥⲩⲗⲏ [ⲁⲩ]ⲱ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲡⲉⲛⲧⲁⲩⲧⲁⲙⲓⲟⲟⲩ ⲙⲛ ⲧⲟⲩⲁⲩⲛⲁⲙⲓⲥ

their chief, Ialdabaoth, came to be as a result of the desire of Pistis Sophia to perform a work without her counterpart. (94,7) Norea is told that she and her sons are not related to the Archons, but to the Father who is from the beginning. (96,19-20) A final section follows in which Eleleth foresees that the true seed (i.e., Norea's) will appear with the coming of the true man. (96,33) The revelation ends with a brief description of the eschaton.

In ParaShem the revelation is a description of the generation of all things from the three primal elements (1,25) as a result of their interaction upon each other, with particular emphasis laid upon the role of the revealer, Derdekeas himself, as the creative and redeeming force of the light principle. There is no dialogue in this tractate.

In Poim, once again, the tenor of the revelation is given by the questions that the recipient wants to have answered: "I desire to learn the things that really exist and to understand their nature and to know God." (3) The revelation begins with Poimandres, "the Mind of the Absolute Sovereignty," changing his form as the recipient looks on. The vision that he sees as he looks into the divine mind is that of the most primal scene of all, the initial act of creation, which was the result of the Logos of the light acting upon nature. (5) This vision is explained by Poimandres. (6) Then the recipient sees another vision--this time in his own mind. And this time it is a vision of the light made up of inumerable powers, which has become a boundless cosmos, and is holding the fire (the result of the initial act of creation) in a fixed position. (7) From there on Poimandres

describes verbally the remainder of creation, beginning with the begetting of "a second Mind—Demiurge," and continuing with things cosmic, terrestial, and human. (8-18)

The two visions in Poim have been described in some detail because they are an exception to the rule that this Gattung has no visions. In the next chapter we will give an explanation for this.

Provision for the Transmission of the Revelation

The Gattung, as we have described it in the Introduction, also involves some kind of commission to the recipient providing for the transmission of the revelation to others.

Daniel is instructed to "shut up the words, and seal the book, until the time of the end." (12,4) By this we are to understand that Daniel, who, according to the fiction of the framework, lives three centuries before the events that climax the revelation given him, is to write what he has been told, and hide it so that when the climactic events arrive, or approach, the revelation may be recovered. Daniel is thus instructed to arrange for the preservation of the revelation for a later generation.[1]

In Jub Moses is ordered: "Come up to Me on the Mount, and I will give thee two tables of stone of the law and of the commandment, which I have written, that thou mayst teach them." (1,1) Later this is expanded: "Incline thine heart to every word which I shall

---

[1] It may be that the instruction here has to do with the whole Book of Daniel, as Montgomery suggests, The Book of Daniel, p. 437, but its context makes it more reasonable to take it simply with the section beginning with 10,1.

speak to thee on this mount, and write them in a book in order that their generations may see how I have not forsaken them . . ." (1,5)

In ApocalBar there is no explicit instruction in the revelation itself that it should be given to a larger number. However, in the preceding, preliminary revelation, we are told that Baruch is to be preserved until the consummation of the times so that he might be a testimony. "So that, if ever those prosperous cities say: 'Why hath the mighty God brought upon us this retribution?' Say thou to them . . ." (13,3-5) Thus the message that is given, according to the fiction of the account, at the time of the fall of Jerusalem to Babylon, is to be transmitted by Baruch himself. As an indication that Baruch feels that some transmission is required of him, we note that after receiving the revelation he assembles all the elders of the people (in Jerusalem), and tells them the essence of the revelation. (31-33,6)[1]

In 1 ApocJas the instructions for transmission are rather complex. James is to keep silent about the things he has learned, except that he is to reveal them to Addai, who apparently is a follower of his. Ten years after war is made against Jerusalem, Addai is to write down what James tells him. After this, Addai is apparently to marry a woman from Jerusalem (lacunae make determination impossible), and have two sons by her. To these he is to tell the revelation "from his mind," and the younger of them, who is greater, is to keep

---

[1] The obvious tension between this act and the instruction and promise in 13,3-5 is an indication of the correctness of Charles' view that this book has been subject to a good deal of editorial activity. Charles, Pseudepigrapha, II, 474-476.

XUM

it hidden until he reaches the age of seventeen. At that time, we gather from the scattering of words remaining in a badly preserved section of the tractate, he is to preach what he has heard. (36,7-38,11)[1]

In SJC the passing on of the revelation is put in the context of a conflict with the Archigenetor and his angels. (125,16-17) Jesus tells his disciples to "tread upon their graves, and humiliate their pronoia, and break their yoke, and arouse that which is mine." (126, 5-12) After his disappearance, we are told: "His disciples began to preach the Gospel of God, the eternal Father, imperishable forever." (127,5-10) In view of the fact that Jesus earlier described his own mission as "teaching everyone about God who is above the all (125,3-5)," there can be little doubt that we are intended by the author to think that the disciples preached the revelation they had just received.

In ApocryJn, Christ instructs John thus: "I have said these things to you so that you might write them and give them to those of a spirit like yours, in secret." (75,15-18) Subsequently he tells him that the reason for writing them down is that they might be certainly preserved, and he adds a curse on anyone who might sell them. (76,8-15)[2] Thus it is clear that the teachings are not to be stored

---

[1] All this sounds like an attempt to authenticate the teachings contained in the "catechism" by tracing them back, in a quite painstaking way, to James, the brother of Jesus. The complexity and precision of this tradition chain make one wonder if there might not have been some authentic traditions behind it.

[2] The similarity between this curse and that in Rev 22,18-19 should not lead one to overlook the difference. In Rev the curse is laid upon anyone who either adds to or takes away from the book. In James the curse is laid on anyone who sells the book and thus allows the teachings to be lost.

XUM

away for some future time (although the future is in view--Christ does not want them to be lost), as in Dan, but to be communicated by John to those who were his contemporaries. However it was only to a certain group that they were to be given, and they were to be kept hidden from others. The tractate ends with John's going and telling the other disciples what he has heard from Christ. (76,18-77,5)

In PetPhil, the apostles ask, at the end of the revelation, how they are to fight with the Archons. The way, they are told, is for them to come together and teach in the world the salvation with a promise. (137,23-25) After they return to Jerusalem we learn that they go to the temple and teach a salvation in the name of Christ. (139,5-7)

In PSoph there are two places where the disciples are enjoined to carry the revelation to men. First, the Lord says to his disciples: "For this cause, therefore, herald to the whole race of men, saying: Cease not to seek day and night, until ye find the purifying mysteries; and say unto the race of men: Renounce the whole world and the whole matter therein."[1] Shortly afterwards, a long section begins in which Jesus instructs the disciples how they are to preach. It begins thus: "When I shall have gone into the Light, then herald it unto the whole world and say unto them: Cease not to seek day and night and remit not yourselves until ye find the mysteries of the Light-Kingdom, which will purify you and make you into refined light and lead you into the Light-kingdom."[2] Then follows a long list of evils that must be

---

[1] Schmidt: 250,24-251,5; S-P: 250.

[2] Schmidt: 256,2-8; S-P: 254.

renounced. At the end of this, Jesus says, "Unto, such, therefore, who have renounced in this renunciation, give the mysteries of the Light and hide not from them at all, even though they are sinners and they have been in all the sins and all the iniquities of the world, all of which I have recounted unto you . . ."[1]

In the Kasr Al-Wizz document the apostles are told by the Savior: "And now, my holy members, go, and preach to all the world, so that they may follow after the cross, (and) obtain this great glory on that fearful day." (18,5-19,3)[2]

In GMary, the Savior says immediately before his departure: "Go, therefore, and preach the Gospel of the Kingdom." (8,21-22)

In NatArch there is no indication as to how the revelation is to be transmitted. It is clear that it is intended for more than Norea, since the words of comfort toward the end are directed to her and her sons. (96,19) This lack may be the result of editorial activity. Bullard notes that OnOrgWld, which follows NatArch, refers to a book of Norea that contains more precise information on certain matters than does OnOrgWld. But, Bullard further notes that that more precise information is not found in the Norea section of NatArch. He then suggests that here we may have only a portion of the book referred to in OnOrgWld.[3] It could be, then, that the instructions

---

[1] Schmidt: 261,14-20; S-P: 260.

[2] ⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩ ⲇⲉ ⲱ ⲛⲁⲙⲉⲗⲟⲥ ⲉⲧⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ ⲃⲱⲕ ⲛⲧⲉⲧⲛ ⲧⲁϣⲉ ⲟⲉⲓⲱ ⲙⲡⲕⲟⲥⲙⲟⲥ ⲧⲏⲣⲩ ⲭⲉⲕⲁⲁⲥ ⲉⲣⲛⲁⲣ ⲛⲧⲁϩⲟⲩ ⲙⲡⲉⲥⲧⲁⲩⲣⲟⲥ [ⲉ]ⲣ[ⲛ]ⲁⲙⲁⲧⲉ ⲙⲡⲉⲓⲛⲟⲩ [ⲙ]ⲉⲟⲟⲩ ϩⲙ ⲡⲉϩⲟⲟⲩ ⲉⲧⲁϩⲟⲧⲉ ⲉⲧⲙⲙⲁⲩ

[3] Bullard, Hypostasis of the Archons, p. 180. See also Doresse, The Secret Books, p. 163.

regarding transmission were in the missing portion. Furthermore, one can see why the editor would have left it out. According to the account into which he places the Norea section, Norea alone is in distress, and it is to her alone that Eleleth comes to bring comfort. Why, then, should this be a revelation that would be passed on to others?

In ParaShem Derdekeas tells Sēem that the things he has revealed up to that point were for the benefit of his (Sēem's) race. (26,18-19) Then he says that what he will reveal in the remainder of his revelation will be given "in order that you may reveal these things to those who will come upon the earth the second time (after the deluge?)." (26,20-25)[1] At another point the author seems to be thinking of a tradition chain. He exhorts Sēem to proclaim the universal teaching to the Sodomites, since they belong to him. They, he assures Sēem, will bear witness to the universal testimony. (29,13-23)

In Poim the recipient is asked, at the end of the revelation: "Now that you have received all things from me, should you not become a guide to those who are worthy, so that through you the race of mankind may be saved by God?" (26) Then the recipient reports: "I began to preach to men the beauty of piety and knowledge . . ." (27) And he further reports that as a result of his initial preaching, some "threw themselves at my feet and begged for instruction. I raised them up and became a guide of mankind,[2] teaching the doctrine

---

[1] ⲩⲓⲛⲁ ⲉⲕⲛⲁⲟⲩⲟⲛϩⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲧⲛⲁⲩⲱⲡⲉ ⲉⲓⲙ̄ ⲡⲕⲁϩ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲙⲉϩⲥⲉⲡ ⲥⲛⲁⲩ

[2] The word translated here as "mankind" is literally "race" (γένος).

of how and in what manner they should be saved." (29)

Sub-types of the Gattung

The examples of the Gattung that we have examined fall naturally into three groupings: Jewish, Christian, and a third group that we will call Neutral, because it has no obvious connection with the other two.

In the Jewish sub-type, there are Dan, Jub, and ApocalBar. The recipients are all worthies of Jewish tradition: Daniel, who is twice referred to in Ezekiel (14,14 and 28,3), Moses, and Baruch, the companion and secretary of Jeremiah.

Daniel and Baruch prepare for the revelation in what seems to have been a typically Jewish way--namely, by fasting. Daniel fasted for three weeks (10,2-3), and Baruch for one. (21,1) The account that Saul fasted before meeting the witch of Endor (I Sam 28,20) may indicate that the tradition of fasting in such circumstances is very ancient. But during the Inter-testamental and early Christian periods it was used for this purpose and also as a general expression of piety.[1]

The revealers are recognizable in Jewish tradition. The revealer in Jub (initially) and ApocalBar is God himself (i.e., the highest being, who concerns himself with the life and fate of the Jewish people). In Jub, the second, and main revealer, the angel of the presence, is probably derived from Is 63,9. The revealer in Dan is un-named, and attempts to identify him with Gabriel do not appear

---

[1] See H. H. Guthrie Jr., "Fast," IDB, II, 234.

convincing. However, elements in the description of this personage can be found in Ezekiel 1,26-28.

The settings are connected with Jewish history and traditions. Daniel stands on the bank of the great river. (10,5) Whether we follow the MT at this point and identify this with the Tigris, or accept Montgomery's suggestion[1] and see this as the Euphrates, the fact remains that either would have been an appropriate place to be standing during the time of the Exile. Moses receives his revelation on Sinai in Jub. And Baruch stands on Mount Zion. (21,2--see 13,1)

In addition it should be noted that the revelations themselves all are centered on the historical life of the Jewish people.

The Christian examples are SJC, ApocryJn, PetPhil, PSoph, 1 ApocJas, the Kasr Al-Wizz document, and GMary.[2] In most of them the recipients are those who were the disciples of Christ while he ministered during his earthly life, according to the traditions found in the Gospels. In SJC, PetPhil, PSoph, Kass Al-Wizz, and GMary they are either all present, or the presence of all of them is probably to be assumed by the general references to "apostles," or "disciples." In SJC, PSoph, and GMary this also includes women who, according to the tradition of the Gospels, had also been Jesus' followers. In ApocryJn the revelation is given to only one disciple, John, one of the two sons of Zebedee. In 1 ApocJas, however, the recipient is James the brother of Jesus. He is not listed in the Gospels as one

---

[1] See p. 9, n. 1 above.

[2] Preliminary work on the identification of elements of this sub-type has been done by H.-C. Puech, in Hennecke, Vol. I, pp. 246, 320-21, 328; and by Helmut Koester in his "One Jesus and Four Gospels," HTR, LXI (1968), 237-38.

of the disciples of Jesus during his earthly ministry. However, Paul records a tradition in which he received an early resurrection appearance.(I Cor 15,7)[1]

The setting in every instance (leaving out of consideration GMary, where nothing is known), is a mountain. It is the Mount of Olives in PetPhil (133,14-15), PSoph,[2] Kasr Al-Wizz (2,10-11), and probably ApocryJn. (20,5-6)[3] In SJC, however, it is a mountain in Galilee called "The place of Harvest Time and Joy." (78,1-2) That the setting of the Mount of Olives was a Christian tradition is shown by Mk 13,3 and Acts 1,12. The setting of SJC may reflect the tradition in Mk 16,7 that after the resurrection Jesus went to Galilee, and was followed there by his disciples. It may also (and perhaps more likely, since no mountain is mentioned in Mk 16,7) reflect the tradition in Mt 28,16-20, where Jesus appears on a mountain in Galilee. The name given the mountain cannot be found in the Gospels, but could be accounted for by the fact that such details are often added to traditional materials in the course of transmission.[4]

The Neutral examples are NatArch, ParaShem, and Poim. Although there may be a connection between OT stories and Norea in

---

[1] For other early traditions of James see W. A. Beardslee, "James," IDB, II, 791-94.

[2] Hennecke, Vol. I, 253.

[3] Till, BG8502, p. 81, suggests that this was the Mount of Olives. This conjecture is unsupported in any of the versions of ApocryJn. But Andrew Helmbold has recently given it support by proposing that the reading ⲟⲩⲙⲁ ⲛ̄ⲭⲁⲉⲓⲉ ("waste place") in BG 20,5-6 may be a corruption of ⲟⲩⲙⲁ ⲛ̄ⲭⲁⲉⲓⲧ ("place of olives").

[4] See R. Bultmann, The History of the Synoptic Tradition, trans. by John Marsh, (3rd revised ed., with supplement; Oxford: 1963), p. 310.

NatArch and Sēem in ParaShem,[1] the connection is secondary and unclear in the case of Norea, and doubtful in the case of Sēem. Furthermore there is no obvious link between these names and either Jewish or Christian tradition of the later Hellenistic period.[2] And the same is true of the revealers not only in NatArch and ParaShem, but in Poim also. These three tractates, then, we set off in a sub-type by themselves.

We have seen how the writings listed at the beginning of this chapter in fact display the Gattung that we described in the Introduction. To show this we have examined the recipients, the revealers, the revelations, and the provisions for transmitting the revelation in all the cases. We then saw how these examples fall into three sub-types: Jewish, Christian, and Neutral. We are now ready to turn to the question of the Sitz im Leben.

---

[1] See discussion of Norea, pp. 6-8, and of Sēem, p. 8.

[2] An exception to this would be Sēem--if one could overcome the problem mentioned on p. 8. See again the material gathered by Doresse, The Secret Books, pp. 154-155.

CHAPTER II

THE *SITZ IM LEBEN* OF THE *GATTUNG*

Gattungen and forms are the outgrowth of specific life-situations. This has been the assumption of Biblical scholars from the time of Gunkel as they have attempted to identify and understand the traditions that are incorporated in the Old and New Testaments. And the light that has been thrown on the Bible as a result has justified that assumption. Therefore, as we try to understand more about the *Gattung* we have identified, it is natural that we begin with the question of the *Sitz im Leben*. We will approach the problem of the *Sitz im Leben* by examining the *Gattung* against the background of the figure of divine Wisdom and the ways by which she is to be approached according to Jewish Wisdom literature.

Before we do this, however, we will turn our attention to what others have said that bears on the question of the *Sitz im Leben*. The caution must be borne in mind here that no one has commented on our *Gattung* itself, since it has not previously been identified. But significant comments have been made about individual writings that are examples of the *Gattung*, and about the form of the revelation part of the *Gattung* per se.

XUM

Review of Previous Research

Jewish Sub-type

Studies tangentially touching on the question of the Sitz im Leben of this sub-type are those having to do with the historical background of Jewish Apocalyptic literature. These we will deal with in Chapter III, where our concern will be the historical implications that can be drawn from our work in Chapters I and II.

Christian Sub-type

Work on the Sitz im Leben of this sub-type has been concentrated on SJC and ApocryJn. Investigations have also been made into the dialogue form of the revelation sections of PSoph, 1 ApocJas, and GMary.

J. Doresse

The first scholar to make a contribution to the question was Jean Doresse. In his The Secret Books of the Egyptian Gnostics he has a section entitled "Gnostics Disguised as Christians."[1] Here he first deals with SJC.[2] He shows that the largest part of the revelation section in SJC exists independently in another Nag Hammadi tractate, The Letter of Eugnostos.[3] In SJC, he contends, this letter was cut up and put into the form of an imaginary dialogue between Jesus and his disciples. The purpose of this, he suggests, was to

---

[1] The Secret Books, pp. 197-218.

[2] Ibid., pp. 198-200.

[3] This letter is found in two versions, one in CG III, and another in CG V.

give to the letter the prestige of a revelation from Christ. His assumption here is that those who did this were outside the Christian community, and were attempting in this way to convert Christians to their way of thinking. On the basis of SJC Doresse argues that the same thing was true for ApocryJn, i.e., that the revelation section was originally independent and had been Christianized for missionary purposes.[1] Thus, for Doresse the Sitz im Leben of the Gattung was missionary activity.[2]

Regardless of the position that one takes on the question of the priority of the Letter of Eugnostos to SJC, and the matter is still debatable,[3] there is nothing in the Christian sub-type of our Gattung that obviously contradicts his insight.

N. R. Petersen, Jr.

A varying position is taken by N. R. Petersen, Jr., in his doctoral dissertation, The Literary Problematic of the Apocryphon of John. Confining himself solely to ApocryJn, and looking only at the

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 200-01.

[2] Similarly, M. Krause, "Das literarische Verhältnis des Eugnostosbriefes zur Sophia Jesu Christi," Mullus: Festschrift Theodor Klauser, JAC, Ergänzungsband 1 (1964), p. 223.

[3] M. Krause in his "Das literarische Verhältnis . . .," Mullus, pp. 215-223, has reached the same conclusion as Doresse on the basis of careful paralleling of SJC with the two versions of The Letter of Eugnostos. The most convincing point in his argument is that the Eugnostos parallels to SJC, BG 108 preserve a more original version of the names of the three aeons than does SJC. (Ibid., p. 221) The opposite opinion (that Eugnostos was secondary to SJC) has been maintained by H.-M. Schenke, "Nag-Hammadi Studien II: Das System der Sophia Jesu Christi," ZRGG, XIV (1962), 263-78. His views were based on only what was available to him in Till's BG 8502, and have therefore been superceded by Krause's, which were based on much more information.

content of the revelation section (which he holds to be a rewriting of Genesis), he reaches the conclusion that ApocryJn's goal is "the edification and stimulation of a community of believers, and (that it) serves the end of encouraging them to stand fast (ⲁⲧⲕⲓⲙ), i.e., not to waver and lose what they have and can count on in the future."[1] He bases this on a rather lengthy analysis of the term "the unwavering generation" (ⲧⲅⲉⲛⲉⲁ ⲛⲁⲧⲕⲓⲙ), which is found three times in CG II, contending that it refers to those who stand firm in the face of persecution. Added confirmation comes, he believes, from the fact that "the redactor/author chose the situation of Jewish-Christian conflict to introduce the problematic of his apocryphon."[2]

Petersen's description of the goal of ApocryJn is not, of course, intended by him to be a Sitz im Leben statement about a Gattung. However, it could be--which is to say that it presents to the mind the possibility that the Sitz im Leben of the Christian sub-type, and perhaps of the Gattung as a whole, is pastoral. Certainly it is true that in many of our examples there is a concern to give encouragement in time of trial; e.g. Dan, ApocalBar, PetPhil, and NatArch. But if this is the purpose of the Gattung (and not just parts of some of the revelation sections), and gives us the clue to its Sitz im Leben, then we must ask, from Doresse's side, why the frames would have been added to the revelation sections. If these words were intended for use simply within a particular community,

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 136-37.

[2] Ibid., p. 137.

could not the words of encouragement have stood by themselves? Petersen suggests an answer for ApocryJn when he says that the frame provides an example of conflict and hence gives the appropriate setting for a revelation of pastoral encouragement. But there is more to the frame of ApocryJn than the conflict situation (eg., the theophany, the mountain, the commission), and one must ask then, why the rest of it? Petersen gives no reply.

It seems best, then, to discard the idea that has come from Petersen, at least in so far as it might be applied to the whole Gattung. If we look at it more modestly, however, as applying to some of the content of some of the revelations in our examples, and hence a motif of significance there, it should be kept in view.[1]

K. Rudolph

In his article, "Der gnostische 'Dialog' als literarisches Genus,"[2] Kurt Rudolph takes a position on the Sitz im Leben of the immediate framework (dialogue) of the revelation section of the Christian sub-type of our Gattung. In addition to ApocryJn and SJC, he considers also GMary, the Apocalypse of Paul (Nag Hammadi), 1 ApocJas, PSoph, the two Books of Jeu, and Mani's Kephalaia.[3] Some of these, of course, are not examples of our Gattung: Rudolph's

---

[1] Giversen, Apocryphon Johannis, pp. 158-59, gives a quite different interpretation of TTENEA NAT KIM from that of Petersen. He contends that those who were thus referred to were to think of themselves as "citizens in another world--that from which their pneumas originate."

[2] Probleme der koptischen Literatur (Halle-Wittenberg: 1968), pp. 85-107.

[3] Ibid., p. 90.

interest was in the dialogue form alone.

He believes that the gnostic dialogue is the result of a combination of two Greek literary form traditions. One is the "true" dialogue tradition, which has a dramatic frame, and in which the purpose of the participants is to wrestle together for the truth. (The best examples, of course, are the Platonic dialogues.) In the course of time, this form tended to become rigid, and was finally used for revelation and catechetical purposes.[1] The other is the tradition of the question and answer form, whose purpose was to enable students to work their way through a given body of information.[2] (The catechism is a typical example.) He believes that a true dialogue does not occur in the gnostic materials because of the rigid authoritarian faith by which they are molded. However they are not merely question and answer literature, since they have frames, which are not characteristic for the question and answer form, but are for the dialogue. The formal character of the dialogue is maintained, but is filled with new content that is influenced by the style of the question and answer literature. Thus, Rudolph holds, through the combination of these two earlier "style-forms" a unique literature form was created.[3]

All this leads Rudolph to the conclusion that the purpose of the gnostic dialogue form is not polemical (against Doresse?), but instructional, and therefore the Sitz im Leben is a school.[4]

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 85-87.

[2] Ibid., pp. 87-88.

[3] Ibid., p. 89.

[4] Ibid., p. 106.

It is impossible to agree with Rudolph's position on the origin of the gnostic dialogue, for the following reasons:

1. Neither of the two traditions that he says were contributors to it really resembles it, by his own admission. This suggests that one might look elsewhere instead of trying to imagine how they might be combined. The obvious place would seem to be Jewish apocalyptic literature, where, as we have seen, and Rudolph himself notes,[1] one does find dialogue combined with frames. But he turns away from this possibility because "inwieweit durch den jüdisch-greichischen Filter die Literaturform des Dialogs, des Orakels und der Zetemata bzw. Problemata den Gnostikern vermittelt wurde, lässt sich schwer ausmachen (dafür ist auf jüdischer Seite zu wenig erhalten und bekannt)."[2]

2. He assumes that the tradition or traditions have to be Greek, because the oldest texts go back to Greek originals. While it is true that there are papyrus fragments in Greek for some of the tractates that Rudolph takes as subjects of his study (see Appendix I), that does not prove that the originals were Greek. It is noteworthy, in this connection, that James, in the Apocryphal Letter of James, says that he is writing in Hebrew.[3] Although this may be a literary fiction, it is not immediately obvious that it is, and therefore one would want to be cautious about claiming that this letter, found in

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Ibid.

[3] CG I, 1, 15-16. Published in M. Malinine, et al., editors, Zurich: 1968.

a gnostic library, was originally written in Greek. It would seem appropriate to exercise similar caution regarding other gnostic writings.[1] Moreover, even assuming that it could be demonstrated that some or even most gnostic tractates originally were written in Greek, that does not say anything about the origin of the literary traditions that were used. The books of the New Testament were presumably written in Greek, but incorporate both Greek and Jewish literary traditions.

Although we cannot agree with Rudolph in regard to the origin of the gnostic dialogue form, nevertheless his position that the dialogue form presupposes an instructional situation certainly is valid. Even if there were no literary examples to prove it, the experience of any teacher or student would confirm it. But we must raise here a word of methodological caution. Because the Sitz im Leben of the form is the school situation, that does not necessarily mean, as Rudolph assumes,[2] that the gnostic dialogues were produced in a school. All it means is that the school form was used in producing them, i.e., that this form was thought to be the appropriate way of setting forth the material. One can imagine that this form might have been used to break up long stretches of discourse that otherwise would have been unassimilable, or, after the fashion of the rhetorical question in the diatribe, it might have been used to

---

[1] In this connection note that in On the Origin of the Worlds (CG II, 5) there are several places where a play on words occurs that only has significance in Hebrew or Aramaic. See A. Böhlig and P. Labib, editors, Die koptisch-gnostische Schrift ohne Titel aus Codex II von Nag Hammadi (Berlin: 1962), pp. 59, 73-4.

[2] Rudolph, "Der gnostische 'Dialog'," Probleme, p. 106.

anticipate the questions of a reader. If we are to come to the conclusion that the Christian examples of our Gattung, or at least the sections of them that display the dialogue form, were produced in a school situation, then we must do so on grounds other than the dialogue form itself.

Rudolph has helped illuminate the form of the revelation sections of the examples of the Christian sub-type of our Gattung. This is important for our investigation, because it is the revelation section that is the focal point of the Gattung, as we have already noted. However, the other elements of our Gattung, and therefore the Gattung as a whole have not been illuminated by his work.

Neutral Sub-type

Reitzenstein, Geffcken, Festugière

It is only in regard to Poim that study has been undertaken touching on the question of the Sitz im Leben.

Reitzenstein, in his Poimandres, assumed that there had existed, from before the time of Christ, an Hermetic religious community. It was from this community that the Hermetic literature came.[1] Thus, for him, the general Sitz im Leben is a religious community. Poim, he believed, was a holy book of this community.[2] In it was enshrined the account of the calling of the founder of the community by the god Poimandres,[3] the preaching given by that god, the founding of the

---

[1] Poimandres (Leipzig: 1904), p. 248.

[2] Ibid., p. 214-15.

[3] Ibid., p. 35.

community, at the behest of the god, and finally the response of praise of the community.[1]

Geffcken carried forward this concept of Reitzenstein's, holding that the whole Corpus Hermeticum served as a devotional book for the community.[2]

But Festugière challenges the presupposition that underlies these views. He does not believe that the Corpus was the work of a religious community in the sense that Reitzenstein and Geffcken meant it, for the following reasons:

(1. The contents of the tractates, looked at as a whole, are a pot pourri of everything that, at the time they were composed, would have been thought of as science--science under the patronage of a god. Festugière believes that this was the way of doing science during the time of declining rationalism from the time of Trajan to the last of the Severians.[3]

(2. He does not deny the presence of eulogistic and edifying elements in some of the tractates, but this, he believes, was characteristic of the time. "La science ne doit plus être cherchée pour elle-même, sa seule utilité est de mener à Dieu."

(3. There is no trace in the Hermetic literature of ceremonies that would have been used by supposed Hermetic believers. No mention is made of anything resembling either sacraments or clergy.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 58.

[2] J. Geffcken, Der Ausgang des griechisch-römischen Heidentums (1920), p. 80.

[3] See Festugière, La Révélation, Vol. I, Chapter I.

4. Furthermore, "sur les vérités les plus essentielle de la religion--sur Dieu, sur le monde et sur l'âme humaine,--le CH presente deux doctrines inconciliable qui entrainment deux attitudes exactement opposées."[1]

Festugière's case is well made. So we may well ask, What then remains of the conclusions of Reitzenstein and Geffcken? Clearly the idea that Poim had its original home in a religious community with the characteristics of a church (with cultic practices and a clergy) is now most unlikely, on the basis of point 3. And on the basis of point 4, it is not possible to think that CH as a whole was produced in a single religious community that was concerned with unity of doctrine. All this makes it very unlikely that Poim served as the sacred scripture that recorded the events and teachings connected with the founding of a religion or a religious community.[2] It also makes it unlikely that it was one book in a Hermetic "Bible." But religion as a factor in the creation of Poim is not ruled out. On the contrary, points 1 and 2 seem to require it.[3] The religious factor, however, was combined with an interest in science, or, to use

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 82-84.

[2] Also counting against this idea is the fact that the recipient in Poim is unnamed. It would be odd if such a basic document had not preserved the name of the founder of the community. Also the initiative for the contact between the recipient and the revealer seems to be with the recipient--quite different from the experience of other founders of religions, or religious communities.

[3] Festugière insists on this point in his criticisms of J. Doresse, who misunderstood his views in an earlier edition of La Révélation, Vol. I. See La Révélation, Vol. I, 427-29.

the more general term, knowledge.[1] Is it possible that Poim and the rest of CH came from a single community? Festugière does not rule that out, so long as it was not cultic, or insistent upon unity of belief. Positing a single community would perhaps be the simplest way to account for the fact that so much Hermetic literature is collected together.

In sum, then, it is possible to think that the general Sitz im Leben was a religious knowledge-oriented community.

Festugière also has a discussion of the form of the Hermetic revelation, which applies to the revelation section in Poim.

> Voici donc défini, en bref, le genre littérature de l'hermétisme philosophique. C'est une homélie, en général assez courte, d'un maître à son disciple, qui présente, sous forme de révélation et sur le ton de la confidence, une doctrine et une direction spirituelles. Il arrive que cette homélie soit introduite et interrompue par quelque interrogation du disciple ou même par un échange de questions et réponses entre le maitre et le disciple, mais ces partie dialoguées n'ont guère de consistance en elle-mêmes et ne sont pas indispensable (il n'ya en pas en C.H. V, VI, IX): ce que compte surtout, c'est l'instruction du maitre.[2]

Although Festugière does not here use the language of Rudolph, the assumed Sitz im Leben of the form of the revelation section is the same: that of a school.

---

[1]The word "science" denotes for English speakers, at least, a method of approaching and investigating reality, together with the results of such approaching and investigating. Since this method was not being used by the writers of CH, it is more accurate to use the term "knowledge."

[2]La Révélation, Vol. II: Le Dieu Cosmique (Paris: 1949), p. 31. He develops the thought of the school situation fully in the following pp. 31-50.

Summary

What can we conclude from this review of previous research? From Rudolph and Festugière, as we have just noted, we have learned that the dialogue form, which is a prominent motif in our Gattung, has its Sitz im Leben in the life of the school: in the interplay between teacher and student.

But this, though helpful, does not tell us the Sitz im Leben of the Gattung as a whole. In regard to that, the suggestion that we found in Petersen, that it is essentially intra-community and pastoral was not convincing. Doresse's view, that the Christian framework of ApocryJn and SJC sprang from the missionary interests of a community we found no reason to challenge. But it was based on a critical evaluation of only one tractate (SJC). Whether it can apply to the general Gattung has yet to be seen.

Reitzenstein's views about both the general and the specific Sitz im Leben of Poim we found it necessary to abandon in the light of Festugière's criticisms. However the possibility suggested itself as a result of Festugière's comments that Poim may have had its original life situation in a religious knowledge-oriented community. This may be a clue for the Sitz im Leben of our Gattung as a whole, but it will only be later in our study that we will be able to assess this.

Elements of the Gattung Compared with Elements in Jewish Wisdom Literature

We will begin the detailed investigation of the Sitz im Leben of our Gattung by turning to Jewish Wisdom literature. We do this for the following reasons:

1. The two earliest examples of the Gattung are Jewish (Dan and Jub) and come from the period in which two pieces of Jewish Wisdom literature were written (Wisdom of Sirach (Sir) and Wisdom of Solomon (Wis)). The connection between apocalyptic (of which Dan and Jub are literary examples) and Jewish wisdom will be explored and defended in the next chapter.

2. The revealer in NatArch identifies himself as "Wisdom" twice. (93,9 and 19) That this figure comes from Jewish sources is suggested by the fact that he shares with the revealer in Jub the characteristic of being an angel of the presence.

3. The figure of Sophia who appears in the revelation sections of most of our examples that are gnostic (1 ApocJn--the Hebrew term is used--, SJC, ApocryJn, PetPhil, PSoph, NatArch), as well as in so many other gnostic documents, has been convincingly traced back to the figure of Wisdom in Jewish sources by George MacRae in his doctoral dissertation, Some Elements of Jewish Apocalyptic and Mystical Tradition and their Relation to Gnostic Literature, Vol. I (University of Cambridge: 1966), 247-96.[1]

We shall deal first with the figure of divine Wisdom and then the ways in which Wisdom is to be approached.

---

[1]MacRae summarizes this section as follows: "Our analysis of Jewish elements in the Gnostic works has shown that whatever the ultimate origin of the personal Sophia, it comes to the Gnostics by way of Judaism. The number of aspects and details of the Sophia myth shared by the Jewish tradition--biblical, apocalyptic, and Hellenistic--and by Gnostic works, especially when taken in conjunction with known debts to Jewish apocalyptic tradition in the same Gnostic contexts (underlining is the author's), makes this conclusion virtually certain." p. 287.

The Figure of the Revealer

Divine Wisdom in Jewish Wisdom Literature

Proverbs 8,1-9,6

In Pr 8,1-9,6 we find the earliest example of a divine wisdom figure in Jewish literature. It is dated well into the Persian period in Palestine (post 538 B.C.), if not later.[1]

When we examine this passage we find the following important characteristics mentioned:

1. Wisdom[2] desires to give what she has to offer. This is clear from 8,1-3 in which she is shown going to all the places where men can be found to urge them to heed her message.

2. She speaks in a special way:

vs. 7 ". . . my mouth will utter truth;
wickedness is an abomination to my lips.

---

[1] Eissfeldt, The Old Testament, p. 473. In his opinion the section in which Pr 8,1-9,6 is found is to be dated "not before the fourth century, or even the third." R. B. Y. Scott concurs in his Proverbs--Ecclesiastes (Garden City: 1965), p. xxxvii. An excellent review of the various opinions about the origin of this figure is given by R. N. Whybray, Wisdom in Proverbs (Naperville: 1965), pp. 79-95. The question of the origin of this figure is not of direct relevance to our argument, and so is not discussed here. In this I include the question of whether the author of this section considered the figure a personification of a divine quality, or an hypostasization having an existence of her own. Not only is the dividing line between these two positions very difficult to define, but, what is more to the point, there is no dispute over the fact that this figure was considered to have an existence in her own right (although always second to Yahweh) in the non-canonical wisdom literature, which means during the time when the earliest examples of our Gattung were produced.

[2] From this point on "wisdom" will be capitalized when it refers to the divine figure.

vs. 8 All the words of my mouth are righteous;
there is nothing twisted or crooked in them.
vs. 9 They are all straight to him who understands
and right to those who find knowledge."

Wisdom speaks truly and righteously. But there is another emphasis here that begins to come out in the second half of verse 8 with the words translated in the RSV as "twisted" (עִקֵּשׁ) and "crooked" (פָּתַל). Although both words can have a moral meaning equivalent to "perverted," and thus may be contrasted with "righteous" (צֶדֶק) in the first half of vs. 8, they also have the basic meaning of "knotted" and "twisted," and thus can also refer to what is unclear. This ambiguity thus connects vs. 8 with vs. 9, where the second meaning comes out in the first half of the verse: "They are all straight (נָכֹחַ) to him who understands." The imagery here is that of one who walks straight toward his goal without deviations that obscure where he is going. And the meaning then is that Wisdom speaks plainly. The meaning is continued in the second half of the verse with יָשָׁר , which can mean not only "right" as the RSV has it, but also "straight" in the same sense as נָכֹחַ . Thus Wisdom speaks both truly and plainly.[1]

3. But Wisdom speaks thus only "to the (one who is in the process of) understanding (לְמֵבִין), and . . . . to the (one who is) coming to knowledge (לְמוֹצְאֵי דָעַת)." Here, then, is another characteristic of Wisdom. She is selective about whom she speaks plainly and truly to. They must already be moving toward understanding

---

[1] Note the LXX reading here: μετὰ δικαιοσύνης πάντα τὰ ῥήματα τοῦ στόματός μου. οὐδὲν ἐν αὐτοῖς σκολιὸν οὐδὲ στραγγαλιῶδες / πάντα ἐνώπια τοῖς συνιοῦσιν καὶ ὀρθὰ τοῖς εὑρίσκουσι γνῶσιν.

and knowledge.

4. Wisdom is also the first thing that was created: "The Lord created me (at) the beginning of his course (קֶדֶם), the first of his acts of old." (8,22)[1] This means that Wisdom was present when everything else was created (8,27-29), and therefore has knowledge about all created things.

5. Wisdom was not only an observer, but also a participant in creation, according to the MT.[2]

6. Moreover Wisdom sends out her messengers to invite those who are foolish (פֶּתִי) to come to her feast. (9,3-6)[3] What this means in non-metaphorical terms is that they are being asked to "leave foolish (things, or people, or both), and live, and walk in the way of understanding (בִּינָה) ." (9,6)

Sirach

The one who desires Wisdom, we learn from Sir 4,17-18, must have faith in her because initially she will frighten him and try him:

---

[1] The "at" is missing in the MT but is found in the Syriac, the Targums, the Vulgate, and in Jerome.

[2] The LXX, Syriac and Vulgate have "a reared up one" instead of "master builder." But the latter meaning was understood by the later wisdom literature; e.g., Wis 7,22; 9,2.

[3] There is a difficult point of grammar in this verse. The second verb in Hebrew is third person, feminine, singular, although a plural seems called for by the context. This has led R. B. Y. Scott to translate the passage: "Having dismissed her maids, she proclaims From the summit . . ." (Proverbs--Ecclesiastes, p. 74, with explanation on p. 77) Whybray comments on the peculiarity in Wisdom in Proverbs, p. 54, n. 3. There are other examples in the OT of such a form being used to equal a plural, he indicates. He says this in the context of his comments on Albright's theory of the origin of this section. Albright had contended that this peculiar usage was one indication of a Ugaritic original.

vs. 17 ". . . at first she will walk with him
on tortuous paths[1]
she will bring fear and cowardice
upon him,
and will torment him by her discipline
until she trusts him,
and she will test him with her ordinances.
vs. 18 Then she will come straight back to him,
and will reveal her secrets to him.

Wisdom of Solomon

Additional characteristics are found in the first century B.C. Wisdom of Solomon.

1. God is capable of giving great gifts of knowledge through Wisdom according to Wis 8,17-22:

vs. 17 For it is he who gave me unerring knowledge of
what exists,
to know the structure of the world
and the activity of the elements;
vs. 18 the beginning and the end and the middle of times,
the alternations of the solstices and the changes
of the seasons,
vs. 19 the cycles of the year and the constellations of
the stars,
vs. 20 the natures of animals and the tempers of wild beasts,
the powers of spirits and the reasonings of men
the varieties of plants and the virtues of roots;
vs. 21 I learned both what is secret and what is manifest,
vs. 22 for Wisdom, the fashioner of all things, taught me.

Thus Wisdom is able to give knowledge of everything having to do with the created order of things, including, it would appear from vs. 18, those things having to do with the realm of history, whether past, present, or future. This is also expressed in Wis 8,8:

. . . if anyone longs for wide experience
She knows the things of old and infers
(or "portrays") the things to come. . .
She has foreknowledge of signs and wonders
and of the outcome of seasons and times.

---

[1]The Gk. of "on tortuous paths" is διεστραμμένως and means literally "in a perverted way."

She is also able to give knowledge of God. She is, the writer says, "a mystagogue" (or "an initiate"--μύστις) of the knowledge of God." (8,4)

2. Here the appearance of Wisdom is described in a variety of ways. It is noteworthy that the images of light predominate.

> She is vapor (ἀτμίς) of the power of God
> and a pure emanation (ἀπόρροια) of the glory
> of the Almighty. (7,25)
>
> She is a reflection of eternal light,
> a spotless mirror of the working (ἐνεργεία)
> of God and an image of his goodness. (7,26)
>
> She is more beautiful than the sun,
> and excels every constellation of the stars.
> Compared with the (natural) light she is
> found to be superior,
> For it is succeeded by the night
> but against Wisdom evil does not prevail. (7,29-30)

Earlier we find it said that "Wisdom is radiant (λαμπρά) and unfading." (6,12)

3. The spirit of Wisdom is described in detail (7,22-23), and the writer says of her that she is able to move (χωρεῖν) through all spirits, and, indeed, everything (7,24), and that she spans the whole earth, and administers everything properly. (8,1)

4. Finally, Wisdom is said to be with God (9,9), and to be in the holy heavens, and at the throne of his glory (since it is from there that the writer asks that she be sent). (9,10)

Summary

What, then, is a divine wisdom figure? Someone who desires to give what he (or she) has to offer. Someone with knowledge of all things, past, present, and future, whether in the heavens (or even

above them), or on the earth. Someone who speaks truly and plainly to those who have already begun the process of understanding, but who can bring fear to the heart of those who trust her before she does so speak. Someone who bids servants go out and invite those who do not have wisdom to come to a feast of wisdom. Someone who was created before everything else, and who participated in the subsequent creation. Someone for whom the imagery of light is particularly appropriate. Someone who can move through other spirits, span the earth, administer all things properly. Someone who dwells with God, and who is close to his throne.

Comparison with Revealers in Examples of Gattung

We will now compare the figure of divine Wisdom that we have just described with the revealers in the examples of our Gattung.

Desire to Give

In none of our examples, of course, do we find the revealer playing the role of a street preacher, as in Pr 8. However the attitude of all the revealers seems to be basically similar to that of Wisdom in Pr 8 toward those who come to them. In most of our instances, they have only to make their questions known, and the revealer proceeds forthwith to answer them. In all cases there is what one might call a benevolent predisposition to give the revelations that are in fact given.

Kind of Knowledge

The most significant characteristic that all our examples have in common with Wisdom is the kind of knowledge. In each of our

cases, as we have noted in Chapter I, the revealer has knowledge of vast spans of time, whether it be the time of earthly history, as in the Jewish type, or cosmological history (which, of course, includes some earthly history too), as in the others. All of the examples also show that the revealer knows not only the past and the present, but the future as well. In the Jewish type, and in NatArch, the revealer also shows that he knows the division of times; i.e., he knows the correct way to divide them (as in Jub), and the amount of time between significant events.[1]

Clear and Plain Speaking

Another universal characteristic of the revealers in our examples that links them with the divine wisdom figure is the fact that in each case they speak plainly, understandably. This does not mean that the revelations are now entirely understandable to us--much of them are very unclear. It means rather that they were intended to seem clear from the point of view of the recipients. Two instances will serve to illustrate the point.

In Dan 7 and 8, Daniel has two visions with accompanying interpretations. At the end of the first Daniel records his reaction: "As for me, Daniel, my thoughts greatly alarmed me, and my color changed; but I kept the matter in my mind." (7,28) What was intended to be comforting (see 7,18 and 27) had instead been frightening. He had not grasped the meaning of the vision. At the end of Chapter 8, after the second vision and interpretation, which had the same intention as those in Chapter 7, he again records his reaction: "And

---

[1] See ApocalBar 27, NatArch 96,27-34, Dan 12,6.

I, Daniel, was overcome and lay sick for some days; then I rose and went about the king's business; but I was appalled by the vision (lit. "appearance"-- מַרְאֶה), and did not understand it." (Lit. "and there was no understanding"-- וְאֵין מֵבִין) But at the beginning of the account in Chapters 10-12 we read: "In the third year of Cyrus . . . a word was revealed to Daniel . . . . And the word was true . . . and he understood the word and had understanding of the vision." (Lit. ". . . and (there was) understanding for him in the appearance-- וּבִין לוֹ בַּמַּרְאֶה) Despite the intervention of Chapter 9, it is a safe assumption that the beginning of 10 harks back to the end of 8, because there is nothing in 9 that picks up the end of 8 or that leads into 10.[1]

What we have, then, in Dan is a comparison between two different kinds of revelation. On the one hand there is the vision-interpretation kind, which gives no understanding, and on the other, the kind in 10-12, which can be understood.[2]

The second instance is in PSoph. During the first eleven

---

[1] There have been suggestions that the largest part of Dan 9 (4-20) is an insertion. (See Eissfeldt, Old Testament, p. 518.) The connection between the end of Dan 8 and the beginning of Dan 10 might make it possible to think of the whole of Dan 9 as an insertion, although this is not necessary for the argument being made here. Later in our discussion we will offer a suggestion for the function of this chapter.

[2] Dan 12,8 ("I heard, but I did not understand.") may seem to present a problem for our interpretation. However it seems clear that this is not meant as a contradiction to 10,1, but is only intended to refer to the response that was given to the question in 12,6 regarding the length of time that would pass before "these wonders" would end. Cf. Otto Plöger, Das Buch Daniel, KAT XVIII (Gerd Mohn: 1965), p. 147.

XUM

years of Jesus' post-resurrection ministry with his disciples he had only taught them "as far as the places of the first commandment, and as far as the places of the first mystery."[1] But when he returns (after his ascension) for the twelfth year, he describes the kind of teaching he will give from that point on in this way:

> From henceforth will I speak with you openly from the beginning of the truth unto its completion, and I will speak with you face to face without parable; I will not hide from you from this hour anything of the things of the height and of the things of the place of the truth. For to me is given by the Ineffable and by the first Mystery of all mysteries the power to speak with you from the beginning to the fulfillment and from within to without, and from without to within.[2]

From these two instances it seems clear that the revealers here and in the other examples also, since the type of revelation is the same, were intended by their authors to be speaking clearly and plainly--understandably--to their recipients.

Prior Understanding of Recipients

It is characteristic of divine Wisdom that she gives her true and plain teaching only to those who already have some understanding, and have found some knowledge. This characteristic is found in all but one of our examples. Daniel, in Dan 9 is at last given instruction which is apparently at least partially understandable to him, and thus can then be understood as preparation for the revelation of Dan 10-12. We note that after the two vision-interpretation chapters (7 and 8) with the record of Daniel's reactions, which we have just reviewed, Chapter 9 brings something quite different.

---

[1] Schmidt 1,3-5; Hennecke, Vol. I, 252-53.

[2] Schmidt 8,23-9,8; Hennecke, Vol. I, 256.

XUM

After a long prayer, Daniel receives there an interpretation of a passage from Jeremiah--without visions. Although Gabriel, the revealer figure, says that he has come to give Daniel wisdom and understanding (9,22), the interpretation is not entirely clear because of the cryptic use of "weeks" to equal "years." But Daniel makes no comment about it, as he did about the two earlier vision-interpretations. It would be reasonable to see this revelation experience as standing half-way between those that precede, and the one that follows. Here Daniel receives some understanding, but full clarity is still lacking.

In Jub, as we have noted in Chapter I, Moses receives preliminary instruction from the Lord (1,4-26) before he receives the revelation from the angel of the presence. Also in ApocalBar, Baruch is given a preliminary revelation that explains some things, but that does not give the precise information that Baruch wants about the times that will precede the end.[1]

In most of the examples of the Christian type the revelations are given to those who the Gospel traditions say were with Jesus during his earthly ministry, and therefore had already received some instruction. An exception is 1 ApocJas. There, however, the first part of the tractate is given over to a description of preliminary instruction given to James before the crucifixion. An exception of another sort

---

[1] Baruch only receives a veiled allusion to it: "And if they say at that time: 'When?' Thou wilt say to them: 'Ye who have drunk the strained wine, drink ye also its dregs, the judgment of the Lofty One who has no respect of persons.'" (13,7-8) ApocalBar 14,1 says, despite the plain evidence, that the "method of the times" has already been shown. Charles rightly points out in his footnote that this has not happened, and blames the confusion on the final editor.

XUM

is PSoph, where, as we have already noted, the preliminary instruction occurred during the first eleven years after the resurrection.

In NatArch preliminary instruction is given in 93,19-32. It is only following it that Norea asks the typical series of questions. (93,32-94,2)

Of all the tractates that we have taken as examples, it is only ParaShem that lacks preliminary instruction, either in the tractate, or implied by the past history of the recipient. No explanation is readily apparent.

In Poim the two visions, which come at the beginning of the revelation, are in the nature of preliminary instruction preceding the discourse proper, which begins with sec. 9. The first vision (secs 4 and 5) is not understood by the recipient. When asked by Poimandres: "Do you understand what this vision means?" his response is: "I should like to know." (sec. 6) Poimandres explains some, but not all, of the vision, so that there is still some lack of understanding by the recipient. The second vision results in consternation (ἐν ἐκκλήξει) on the part of the recipient.[1] The explanation, which does not seem adequate to this reader, is however not questioned by the recipient. But the visions and their explanations have not taught him all that he wants to know: "What about the elements of nature--whence did they arise?" (sec. 8) Here, then, is the point at which the revelation discourse begins.

Light Imagery

Another characteristic that ties the revealer, in most of the

---

[1] Cf. Dan 7,28.

examples of our Gattung, with the divine wisdom figure, is the imagery of light. Although we have already noted this imagery in Chapter I, it will perhaps be helpful to bring it all together here.

In Dan the revealer is clothed in linen and girded with gold, his face is like lightning, and his eyes like flaming torches. In Jub the revelation is given in the midst of divine glory, which is like a flame of fire. (1,2-3) In ApocalBar Baruch apparently receives the revelation from God while looking into heaven, and seeing the divine glory. (21,25 and 22,1)

In SJC the revealer is said to be like a great angel of light. In ApocryJn the three-formed revealer appears in the midst of light. In the Letter of Peter to Philip nothing apparently is seen of the revealer except a great light. In PSoph Jesus, when he returns from his ascension, appears in the midst of three different lights, each one surpassing the other, from the inside out.[1] Later in the revelation we learn that these three lights are three robes, and each one has knowledge about the celestial realm, and all three encompass the totality of knowledge.[2] Thus it is the light itself which makes Jesus a wisdom figure.

In NatArch the revealer is said to have a likeness like precious gold, and raiment like the snow. He describes himself as one of the four luminaries that stand before the great, invisible spirit. In ParaShem Derdekeas describes himself as "the ray of the universal Light . . ." (4,6-7), as "the Son of the undefiled, infinite

---

[1] Hennecke, Vol. I, 255.

[2] S-P: 17-19; Schmidt: 17,7-19,15.

Light" (4,14-31), and again as "the perfect light who is above the Spirit and the darkness, and who puts to shame the Darkness." (10, 21-23)[1] In Poim, although the revealer appears initially only as a being of immeasurable size, he later identifies himself as the light that the recipient has seen in his vision. (sec. 6) Only in 1 ApocJas and in the Kasr Al-Wizz document is no light mentioned. (About GMary we know nothing regarding this since the initial part, where we might expect to find such a description, is missing.)

Initial Fear by Recipients

In Sirach we noted that Wisdom is said to bring fear and cowardice upon those who seek her in order to test them before she reveals her secrets to them. The initial fear of the recipients is a motif in five of our examples. Twice in Dan Daniel is overcome with fear. Immediately after the appearance of the vision of the revealer he says: "no strength was left in me; my radiant appearance was fearfully changed, and I retained no strength . . . when I heard the sound of his words, I fell on my face in a deep sleep . . ." (10,8-9) The trembling Daniel is raised by the revealer, who tells him to "fear not." (10,12) But no sooner does he finish speaking than Daniel "turned (his) face to the ground and was dumb." (10,15) Finally he is strengthened enough to receive the revelation. (10,18) In SJC, when the revealer appears, all the disciples wonder and are afraid. (79,12-13) In ApocryJn John is frightened by the events that

---

[1] ⲦⲀⲔⲦⲒⲚ ⲙ̄ⲡⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓⲛ ⲛ̄ⲕⲁⲑⲟⲗⲓⲕⲟⲛ — ⲡⲱⲏⲣⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓⲛ ⲛⲛⲁⲧⲭⲱⲥⲙ ⲉⲧⲉ ⲙ̄ⲙⲛⲧⲉⲩ ⲁⲣⲏϫⲩ — ⲡⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓⲛ ⲉⲧϫⲏⲕ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲉⲧ ⲙⲡⲥⲁⲛϩⲣⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲙ̄ⲛⲁ ⲙ̄ⲙⲛ ⲡⲕⲁⲕⲉ· ⲡ<ⲣ>ⲉⲩⲧⲱⲓⲡⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲕⲁⲕⲉ

precede the coming of the revealer. (20,19-21,23) In PSoph the disciples are "exceedingly afraid and troubled."[1] And in Poim, as we have already noted, the recipient's response to the second vision, which immediately precedes the revelation section, is consternation.

Sending out of Servants

Wisdom sends her servants out to call people to the feast of wisdom. We have seen in Chapter I that in each of our examples (with the exception of NatArch) there is a commission of some sort in which the recipients are bidden to transmit to others what they have learned. Sometimes they are told to go out and preach. Other times (Dan, Jub and 1 ApocJas), to begin a transmission chain that will eventually lead to the revelation's being given to others.

Dwelling with God, at His Throne

The revealers are all divine beings, as we have shown, and their closeness to the highest divinity is often emphasized. In Dan, as we have seen, the revealer is apparently on a higher level than the patron angels, and more awe-inspiring than Gabriel. In Jub he is an angel of the presence. In ApocalBar he is in or beyond the heavens, since the heavens open so that Baruch can see his glory. And he is, of course, God himself. In all the Christian sub-type examples the revealer is Jesus after the resurrection. This in itself makes him a divine being, since he has a prime characteristic of divinity--immortality. (See Gen 3,22 and Rev 1,17-18) However in most of the instances the divine aspect is emphasized by dramatic changes in

---

[1]Hennecke, Vol. I, 255; Schmidt: 5,20-22.

appearance, as we have already seen. That he comes from the realm of the divine is indicated in ApocryJn by the opening of the heavens.[1] Here it is made clear that he is at least an aspect of the divine triad by the initial visionary appearance, and self-identification, which we have already noted. The revealer in NatArch, Eleleth, is said to stand in the presence of the Holy Spirit. The closeness of Derdekeas in ParaShem is indicated by his describing himself as the son of the Light, and its ray. The same closeness is also indicated by Poimandres' description of himself as "the Mind of the Absolute Sovereignty." (sec. 2)

Present at the Creation

In Jub the angels of the presence are said to have been created on the first day. This means that they were able to witness the rest of creation. In ParaShem Derdekeas appears in what seems to be the first act of the exalted light in the creative process. (3,34-4,3)

Participant in Creation

In ParaShem Derdekeas is an active participant in creation.

Spans the Earth

In Poim Poimandres tells the recipient that he is with him everywhere (πανταχοῦ). (sec. 2) We have already seen that a similar expression is found in ApocryJn, spoken by the revealer about himself. (21,18-19)

---

[1] The most recent and most complete collection of examples of the opening of the heavens motif is found in Fritzleo Lentzen-Deis, "Das Motiv der 'Himmelsöffnung' in verschiedenen Gattungen der Umwelt-literatur des Neuen Testaments," Biblica, 50 (1969), 301-27.

XUM

Summary

The nature of the characteristics that are parallel between all our examples and the figure of divine wisdom appear to establish a high degree of likelihood that all our revealers are divine wisdom figures. Additional confirmation has come from the elements that are found in one or more of our examples that are similar to those found in the description of Wisdom.[1]

The Approach to the Revealer

When we turn our attention from the divine wisdom figure herself to the question of how one approaches Wisdom, we find additional parallels between Jewish wisdom literature and the examples of our Gattung.

Approaches in Jewish Wisdom Literature

In Pr 8,17 we learn that it is those who seek Wisdom diligently who find her. (Similarly, Sir 24,19.) This means going where she will

---

[1] It is an interesting question why Wisdom in Pr, Sir and Wis is feminine and all the revealer figures in the examples of our Gattung are masculine. It may be that the Gattung was influenced by a tradition in which the divinity that provided the pattern for the wisdom figure was masculine. A possibility is the Zoroastrian tradition in which the ultimate divinity was Ahura Mazdah--"The Wise Lord." Influence from this direction would have been possible from the time of Persian suzerainty over Palestine. One point of literary similarity is the form of the series of questions to the revealer. In the examples of our Gattung this commonly precedes the revelation. (We will be reviewing the examples in the next section.) The same form is found in Yasna 44. (See Jacques Duchesne-Guillemin, The Hymns of Zarathustra (Boston: 1963), pp. 63-73.)

Another explanation for the masculinity of these figures would be that angels (masculine in Heb and Gk) were the customary intermediaries between man and God in the Jewish tradition, and that to have brought a female intermediary figure into these accounts would therefore have seemed too obvious a novelty.

be found: "Happy is the man who listens to me, watching daily at my gates, waiting beside my doors." (Pr 8,24. See also Sir 14,24.) Sirach tells how, when he was young, and before he set out on his travels, he sought Wisdom in prayer. (Similarly, Wis 7,7.) Sirach says that he asked for her before the temple (ἐναντι ναοῦ). (51,14) Sirach also says that he found Wisdom through purification. (51,20) Those who find her must desire instruction. (Wis 6,17; 8,21-9,18)

Comparison with Approaches in Examples of Gattung

Going where Wisdom Will Be Found

Those who seek Wisdom must go where she will be found. This is a motif in all of our examples, with the exception of Dan and NatArch. In all of these except ParaShem and Poim the would-be recipients either go to a mountain in order to meet the revealer, or they are simply there as the account begins. That the mountain was thought of in the Hebrew tradition as the gate and door to the divine, i.e., the place closest to the divine dwelling where one properly goes to meet the divine, is shown in the accounts in Ex 19ff of the theophanies to Moses on Mount Sinai. In the Greek tradition the same idea is enshrined in the Iliad; e.g., I,498-99, where Thetis seeks out Zeus to intercede for Achilleus, and finds him on the top of Mount Olympus.[1]

Although Poim and ParaShem lack mountains, they have something

[1]This meaning of mountains for religions generally has been shown by M. Eliade in his Patterns in Comparative Religion, trans. by Rosemary Sheed (Cleveland: 1958), sections 31 and 143.

similar. In each the understanding (διανοία in Poim 1 and μεστε in ParaShem 1,7) rises up from earthly things. Sēem even says that his thought took him to the top of creation. (1,8-9) It is only after having thus risen that the recipients meet their respective revealers.

Before the Temple

Sirach asks for Wisdom before the Temple (ἔναντι ναοῦ). As we have noted before,[1] in four of our examples the setting is the Mount of Olives (ApocryJn, PetPhil, PSoph and Kasr Al-Wizz). The Mount of Olives was κατέναντι τοῦ ἱεροῦ, according to Mk 13,3.

Purification and Prayer

Wisdom is found through purification and prayer. We have already noted that fasting--a form of purification of the soul--occurs in Dan and ApocalBar before the revelation. Prayer also occurs in ApocalBar 21,4-25, immediately preceding the revelation. It is also found in PetPhil (133,21-134,9), where it has a chant-like quality, and 1 ApocalJas (30,28-31,1).

Desire for Instruction

Those who would approach Wisdom must desire instruction. This motif is found in most of our examples as a series of questions presented to the revealer before the revelation begins. We have already noted the instances, and quoted most of them, in the section in Chapter I beginning on p.15 . The tractates in which such series are found

---

[1] See p. 30.

are SJC (78,3-12), ApocryJn (20,7-18), PetPhil (134,23-135,2), PSoph,[1] and NatArch (93,33-94,2). Questions are also found in the body of the prayer of Baruch in ApocalBar. Poim has several questions before the visions begin, but not in the serial arrangement characteristic of SJC and those cited above with it. (sec. 2 and 3) Kasr Al-Wizz has only one question. (8-9) Only in Dan, Jub, 1 ApocJas, and ParaShem are such initial questions lacking. But in Dan the desire for understanding is recognized by the revealer when he says to Daniel: ". . . from the first day that you set your mind to understand and humbled yourself before your God, your words have been heard, and I have come because of your words." (10,12) In 1 ApocJas the questions are found in the pre-crucifixion part: "For what will they (the Archons) do? What will I be able to say? Or what word will I be able to say that I may escape them?"[2] And in ParaShem the fact that Sēem's thought or understanding took him to the pinnacle of creation is probably to be understood in the sense that he was making inquiry into the things known only in the divine realm, i.e., that he desired to be instructed. The lack of questions in Jub can perhaps best be understood from the fact that in Exodus Moses can be seen as the representative of the desire of the whole of Israel to know the will of the God who had delivered them from the Egyptians. If this was the understanding of the author of Jub, then Moses' desire for instruction would have been presupposed.

---

[1]Hennecke, Vol. I, 255-56.

2 ⲟⲩ ⲡⲉⲧⲟⲩⲛⲁⲁⲁⲩ ⲟⲩ ⲡⲉⲧⲛⲁⲩⲭⲟⲟⲩ ⲏ ⲁⲩ ⲛⲁⲩⲁⲭⲉ ⲡⲉⲧⲛⲁⲩⲭⲟⲟⲩ ⲩⲁⲛⲧⲣ ⲃⲟⲗ ⲉⲣⲟⲟⲩ

The occasional piece of dialogue that occurs in every example except Jub and ParaShem, also testifies to the fact that the recipients desired instruction.

Summary

We have compared the figure of Wisdom and the approaches to her found in Jewish wisdom literature with the examples of our Gattung. We have found similarities between the wisdom material and all our examples in the following particulars: the predisposition of the revealer to give what is asked for; the kind of knowledge displayed by the revealer; the clear and plain nature of the revelation; the commission; the heavenly character of the revealer; the desire for instruction by the recipients. The following wisdom elements were found in most of our tractates: light imagery associated with the revealer; prior understanding by the recipients; the going to, or being at, an appropriate place to meet the revealer. In addition we noted other elements that appear in one or more of our examples.

Conclusion

The number and significance of these parallels are strong grounds for believing that our Gattung is a wisdom Gattung. By the term "wisdom Gattung" I mean that it springs from the Jewish Wisdom Movement. (The significance of this statement will be explored in the next chapter.) But I also mean that it springs from what I think might properly be called the wisdom religious experience.

This experience is set forth in materials that we have already

reviewed and quoted. It begins with a desire for knowledge.[1] Then the seeker turns (various means could be used)[2] to the highest divine source of knowledge,[3] who gives a revelation regarding the request in a way that is plain and clear,[4] but who also gives a commission to the effect that the revelation should be made known to others.[5] Of course, as we have also noted, there are other elements in the pattern of this experience, but these seem to be the basic ones. They closely parallel the pattern that we have outlined for our Gattung.

This experience combines the two elements that Festugière observed in Poim and the rest of the CH: interest in knowledge, and interest in religion. It could be called a religious way to knowledge about all things.

It also includes the instructional situation that both Festugière and Rudolph observed as being implicit in the form of the revelation sections of the materials they investigated. But this is not a literary form (or forms) brought in from outside, as Rudolph thought. Rather it is inherent in the experience. The seekers go to the divine source of knowledge to learn. Out of this springs the dialogue. As we have observed, the questions, which are the key element in the dialogue, could also serve the purpose of demonstrating that those

---

[1] See pp. 61-2.

[2] See pp. 61-2.

[3] See pp. 47-8.

[4] See pp. 46-7.

[5] See p. 48.

who sought Wisdom really desired instruction.[1]

Our investigations have given us good reason to think that our Gattung originated in this experience.

But then we must find a satisfactory explanation for the fact that the examples of the Gattung do not come to us in the form of personal testimonies by obscure individuals who had had this experience. Here are Daniel, Moses, Baruch, the apostles and "the women," Norea and Seem.

Following Doresse,[2] I offer the following as an explanation that seems to fit the facts:

Those who felt constrained to share the knowledge they believed they had received had to find a way to present it to outsiders so that it would be accepted for what they believed it was: knowledge from the highest divine source. They could not depend on the fact that those outside their own coterie would know anything about their way of gaining this knowledge, or be sympathetic if they did. The method, then, in the case of outsiders who were Jews or Christians, was to choose for the recipients, or the seekers, those who were already known and revered from the respective traditions. The same seems to have been done for the revealer figures: an angel of the presence in Jub, God himself in ApocalBar; Jesus for the Christians. The figure in Dan presents a special problem. Although we cannot give him a name, it may be that Dan's first readers would have been able to. A considerable angelology had been carried over from

---

[1] See pp. 61-2.

[2] See pp. 33-34.

the Persian period,[1] and no doubt a great deal more angel-lore existed than has been preserved for us. However we do not know with certainty that he would have been recognized, so Dan may be an exception.

The case is somewhat different with the Neutral sub-type. There, as we have observed, the names of both the recipients and the revealers are obscure (the former is absent in Poim, of course), and not clearly associated with any tradition. They are however vaguely suggestive of something Egyptian (if Dodd or Marcus is correct about the origin of the name "Poimandres"[2] and if I am about the origin of "Eleleth"), or Hebrew ("Norea" and "Sēem). Derdekeas does not seem to have even a vague connection with any tradition. It is simply mysterious. But this vagueness and mysteriousness--with the hint of things oriental--may have been designed precisely to appeal to the non-Christian, non-Jewish Greek, for Festugière tells us that "le mirage oriental avait toujours séduit les imaginations de la Grèce."[3]

Thus this Gattung appears not only to express the wisdom religious experience, but also, if our explanation be accepted, to

---

[1] See David Winston, "The Iranian Component in the Bible," History of Religions, 5 (1966), 192-93; D. S. Russell, The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic (Philadelphia: 1964), pp. 235-262.

[2] The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel (Cambridge: 1953), p. 30. He writes, "The strange name probably represents the Egyptian Pe-eime-n-Re, 'The Knowledge of Ra'. . ." R. Marcus also proposes an Egyptian derivation. See p. 15, n. 3.

[3] La Révélation, Vol. I, p. 20. The whole of Chapter II, from which this quotation is taken, is in effect devoted to denomstrating the truth of the quotation.

have been used for what might be called missionary purposes.

We have already observed in the Introduction that this is a revelation Gattung. We can now define it more precisely within this general category as a missionary, wisdom Gattung.

CHAPTER III

HISTORY OF THE GATTUNG

The two previous chapters have implicitly raised two broad historical questions, which must now be dealt with. The questions are: (1) If this is indeed a wisdom Gattung, how does it happen that the Jewish sub-type has commonly been associated with Apocalyptic literature? (2) In what way is it possible to understand historically the relationships among the Jewish, Christian and Neutral sub-types?

The Relationship between Wisdom and Apocalyptic

No Relationship

In the past Apocalyptic literature has commonly been related historically almost exclusively to prophecy. "Apocalyptic is the child of prophecy," writes H. H. Rowley, who may be taken as representative. By this he means that the expectations of the end as expressed by the prophets were taken up and developed by the Apocalyptists.[1] If in another writing he adds that Apocalyptic is "yet diverse from prophecy . . ."[2] he only means to make room for the

---

[1] H. H. Rowley, "Apocalyptic Literature," Peake's Commentary, sec. 418d.

[2] H. H. Rowley, The Relevance of Apocalyptic (New and Revised edition; New York: 1963), p. 15.

difference of forms, time, and situation between apocalyptic and prophecy, as well as for Persian ideas.[1] No mention is made of wisdom. However recent discussion has substantially altered, and even discarded this older view.

Apocalyptic Roots in Wisdom--G. Von Rad

In the first edition of his Old Testament Theology, published initially in 1960, G. Von Rad tells us that the real matrix from which Apocalyptic literature comes is not prophecy but wisdom.[2] In the fourth edition of this work, some five years later, he not only reiterates this unorthodox view, but gives it greater force by recasting and expanding his arguments, and adding a section on the tradition-historical background.

In general he argues that prophetic eschatological hope had been domesticated in the post-exilic period by legalistic-pietism and that the kind of hope in Apocalyptic literature was based upon entirely different presuppositions and conceptions.[3] Because of the importance of Von Rad's arguments for this dissertation I will review in detail the points that he makes. They are as follows:

1. The concept "apocalyptic" is not one that has been

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 15-16 and pp. 39-44. For a similar opinion see also D. S. Russell, The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic, pp. 88-96.

[2] G. Von Rad, Old Testament Theology, Vol. II: The Theology of Israel's Prophetic Traditions, trans. by D. M. G. Stalker (Edinburgh: 1965), 306.

[3] G. Von Rad, Theologie des alten Testaments, Band II: Die Theologie der prophetischen Überlieferungen Israels (5th Auflage; München: 1968), pp. 317-18.

satisfactorily defined. If one looks at it either as a literary phenomenon, or as a phenomenon having to do with a theological world-view, in neither case has a satisfactory explanation of its background been offered.[1]

2. The titles given to the apocalyptic recipients are a significant indication of where we might look for such a background. Daniel is described as a court wiseman. (Dan 1,3ff and 2,48) Enoch is called a scribe and a "scribe of righteousness" (Enoch 12,3f; 15,1; 92,1), meaning that he is a teacher whose wisdom is superior to the wisdom of all men. (Enoch 37,4) Finally, Ezra is called "scribe of the knowledge of the highest." (2 Esd 14,50)[2] These apocalyptists were interested in astronomical and cosmological problems (traditional wisdom interests[3]) as much as they were with the question of the ordering of history. One of the most significant of the apocalyptic books--Enoch 37-71--is called "words of wisdom." (37,2) If apocalyptic were a continuation of prophecy, it would be most strange that the names of the great prophets had not been used in the Apocalyptic literature, but rather the names of the "Ahnherren" of wisdom: Daniel, Enoch, and Ezra. At the end of Dan one finds, indeed, an apotheosis of the wisdom teacher. (12,3)[4]

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 316-17.

[2] For the identity of scribe and wiseman see Matthew Black, "Scribe," IDB, IV, 246.

[3] See G. Von Rad, Old Testament Theology, Vol. I: The Theology of Israel's Historical Traditions, trans. by D. M. G. Stalker (Edinburgh: 1962), p. 451.

[4] G. Von Rad, Theologie, Band II, pp. 317-18.

XUM

3. What rules the apocalyptic books in every aspect is the desire for knowledge that is so characteristic of wisdom.[1] It is the desire for knowledge about the wide field of universal history. But it is also the desire for knowledge about the whole area of nature. This leads to "einer geradezu hybrid anmutenden universalen Gnosis." The desire for knowledge pushes even to the throne of God. Apocalyptic can then be called the unveiling of the last secrets of the world.[2]

4. There is no unity between the understanding of history of the apocalyptists and the prophets. There is no way to move from the specific salvation-historical anchoring of the prophetic message in the idea of election to the "Geschichtsbild" of apocalyptic, and even less to its idea that the last things are determined from the beginning.[3] (This does not mean, however, that every characteristic of apocalyptic differs from those of the prophets. Prophetic writings were used by the apocalyptists as were traditions from other sources.[4])

5. When one turns to tradition-historical questions, it is obvious that behind both Enoch and Daniel lies much traditional material. How then to distinguish between what is traditional and what is essentially apocalyptic? In Esther 1,13 wisemen are described as "those who understand the times." This characteristic, along with

---

[1] See G. Von Rad, Theology, Vol. I, p. 425-26.

[2] G. Von Rad, Theologie, Band II, pp. 318-19.

[3] Ibid., p. 321. See this page and p. 322 for the detailed points of this argument. We follow it no further because it is not related directly to our interest.

[4] Ibid., pp. 322-23.

XUM

the related ones of understanding the meanings of oracles and signs, and the interpretation of royal dreams, is the most significant function of the wiseman in ancient times. The idea of the divine determination of the times, upon which all apocalyptic ideas rest, is a basic idea of ancient oriental wisdom. Also the ideas that all men have a time assigned to them, and that it is the function of wisemen to know these times--these ideas are from Old Testament wisdom. "Macht man sich von der Suggestion von der Apokalyptik als eines ganz neuen religiösen Phänomens frei, so rückt die Funktion der Apokalyptiker und die jener die Zeiten verstehenden Weisen des Alten Orients nahe zusammen."[1] Daniel can be instructively compared with Joseph.[2]

6. The rich store of cosmological lore seems also not to be specifically apocalyptic.[3] However it is used paranetically in apocalyptic. The writers want to console, and to admonish to preseverance through the view about the nearness of the time of change. But this paranetic element is not specifically apocalyptic. It is also found in wisdom, particularly in its later expressions. Apocalyptic is occupied with problems of theodicy. But "nirgends als in der Weisheit wurde ja die Frage nach dem Sinn der Welt so konsequent vom Menschen aus gestellt."[4]

7. The dialogue form that one finds occasionally in apocalyptic

---

[1] Ibid., p. 325.

[2] Ibid., p. 323-26. For Joseph as an ideal wisdom figure see Von Rad, Theology, Vol. I, 432.

[3] See point 3 above.

[4] Von Rad, Theologie, Band II, p. 326.

is a wisdom style form. In this way wisdom appears to have been taught in the schools. When the revealer in apocalyptic answers by referring to some fact of nature indicating that an analogy is being made between the natural order and the divine activity, he is making use of a doctrine that is specifically part of wisdom theology.[1] Also the apocalyptic idea that knowledge of divine things is given only to some men (those who have not fallen from God), is found in wisdom. "Nach alledem kann wohl behauptet werden, dass die apokalyptischen Schriften sowohl hinsichtlich ihrer Stoffe wie hinsichtlich ihrer Fragestellungen wie hinsichtlich ihrer Argumentation in den Überlieferungen der Weisheit wurzeln."[2]

8. The general characteristics that up to now have been used to describe the nature of apocalyptic need revision, because they proceed too much from the assumption of the inner unity of apocalyptic.

> Specifically, apocalyptic is neither the esoteric, nor the periodizing of history, nor the concept of the trancendental nature of the gifts of salvation, nor the interpretation of canonical scriptures, nor pseudonymity, nor the interpretation of dream visions, nor the accounts of journeys through the heavens, nor the historical survey in the style of wisdom.[3]

9. However, when one turns to the specifically eschatological aspects of apocalyptic, one finds a different situation. "Mit ihrem Ausblick auf das Ende der Geschichte, auf ein Weltgericht und eine

---

[1] See Von Rad, Theology, Vol. I, 424.

[2] Von Rad, Theologie, Band II, 328.

[3] Ibid. The translation is that of J. W. Leitch, and is found in Robert W. Funk, ed., Apocalypticism, Journal for Theology and the Church, 6 (New York: 1969), p. 136.

XUM

Erlösung bringt die apokalyptische Geschichtsschau doch etwas Neues." It is not difficult to believe that these ideas came from foreign, specifically Iranian collections of lore, which those interested in wisdom had examined as a result of their searching into the question about the last things, which in turn would have been the result of their quest for encyclopedic knowledge. That Israel would have been so influenced during the time of the Persian rule is scarcely surprising. Also it is significant that Iranian apocalyptic is a revelation of world events from the creation to its renewal, that in it time is divided into periods, and that there is mention of a consummatio mundi, a resurrection of the dead, and a transformation of the world.[1]

10. When did this eschatological horizon penetrate the older wisdom? The fact that it appears quite suddenly speaks for a late date. But what is known of the literary work of the third and fourth centuries B.C.? The priestly document (P) may well have known more about Enoch than is mentioned in Gen 5,24. P organized history into divisions of time far beyond what was done in the older Pentateuchal source. If P did not explicitly look forward to an eschatological culmination of the world, yet on the basis of Nu 14,21[2] it would seem that it was aware of the idea. Nu 14,21 is interesting because it so little fits the specific priestly concerns, but the theological idea that it contains is not uncongenial with the contents of P. This

---

[1] Von Rad, Theologie, Band II, 329-30.

[2] ". . . but truly, as I live, and as all the earth shall be filled with the glory of the Lord . . ."

idea is found also in 3rd Isaiah (65,17 and 66,22) at the end of the sixth century B.C. Of course the division of history into segments is not specifically eschatological so long as a division is not made between the time of salvation and the time before. But is the broad dualism between the aeons, which is thought of as specifically apocalyptic, anything different in principle from the division between the time of salvation and the time before in the life of the individual that wisdom spoke of?[1]

11. Wisdom, however, is not continued *in extenso* in apocalyptic, but only some of its elements--above all the old dream interpretation lore, and the lore of the oracles and the signs.[2]

12. In sum, "dies . . . scheint festzustehen, dass unser Begriff 'Apokalyptik' dringend einer kritischen Überprüfung bedarf, weil seine summarische Verwendung zur Definition sowohl eines literarischen Phänomens wie eines theologischen Phänomens problematisch geworden ist.[3]

Criticisms of Von Rad's View

Vielhauer

Von Rad's views have been criticized by several scholars. P. Vielhauer[4] agrees that apocalyptic should not be thought of as

---

[1] Von Rad, *Theologie*, Band II, 330-31. On the last point see Von Rad, *Theology*, Vol. I, 443-44.

[2] Von Rad, *Theologie*, Band II, 331.

[3] *Ibid.* In footnote 28 on this page Von Rad also points out that apocalyptic represents no special *Gattung*. From a form critical point of view it is a *mixtum compositum*.

[4] P. Vielhauer, "Introduction to Apocalypses and Related Subjects," Hennecke, II, 596-98.

a continuation of prophecy, but disagrees with the idea that apocalyptic is rooted in wisdom.

> The fact that there is no eschatology and imminent expectation in the Wisdom literature corresponding to the presence of Wisdom-motifs in the Apocalypses forms an insurmountable objection to his thesis. The eschatological ideas and the expectation are doubtless primary and so fundamental that the Wisdom elements must be evaluated as colouring, and not as the basis.

But he goes on to say that "the fact that connections with 'Wisdom' exist . . . is undeniable."[1]

Vielhauer's comments were made in response to the first edition of Von Rad's Old Testament Theology. Von Rad seems to be responding to this criticism in the new tradition-historical section in his fourth edition. There (see particularly point 9 above) he admits that the kind of eschatological outlook found in apocalyptic is not found in wisdom, and he makes a case for these ideas having come from Iran--but through those who were interested in wisdom. Thus he has taken Vielhauer's objection into consideration, but not in such a way that he has had to lessen his claim that apocalyptic is rooted in wisdom.

F. Cross

Frank Cross disagrees with the idea that there is no primary connection between apocalyptic and prophecy. He believes that more research is needed into the way in which pre-exilic prophetic oracle types were slowly transformed into, first, proto-apocalyptic, and then early apocalyptic, and finally apocalyptic itself.[2] But he

---

[1] Ibid., p. 598, for both quotations.

[2] Otto Plöger has in fact attempted to do just this in his Theocracy and Eschatology, trans. by S. Rudman, Richmond: 1968. He

believes that the importance that Isaianic literature had among the apocalyptists makes it clear that the prophets had great influence on them. Cross, however, has no word of disagreement with the connection Von Rad makes between wisdom and apocalyptic.[1] He suggests in fact that as early as the sixth century, B.C., the wisdom and prophetic traditions coalesced (along with history and myth), and never fully separated again.[2]

M. Hengel

Martin Hengel also has some critical remarks. Speaking about the period of Dan (which he calls "der erste Höhepunkt judischer Apokalyptik") he asserts that "Prophetisches Bewusstsein und weisheitliche Gelehrsamkeit wurden jetzt untrennbar miteinander verflochten."[3] The idea of wisdom in this period is just as unclear as that of apocalyptic. (A response to Von Rad--see point 1 above.) It can refer to various forms, from the Greek wisdom of the Hellenists, to

---

assumes that the ruling priestly-aristocratic party in Judah in the third and fourth centuries B.C. believed that the promises of God were fulfilled in the creation of their theocracy, while others disagreed and nurtured their eschatological faith in conventicles. The development of eschatological faith in these conventicles accounts for the difference between prophecy and apocalyptic. R. Tournay's assessment of this hypothesis (and that is what Plöger frankly intends it to be--see p. 116) seems correct: "Je crois forcée l'opposition que O. Plöger propose de descerner entre l'idéal théocratique et l'espérance eschatologique. Ces deux aspects d'une même mentalité sont présents chez les prêtres-scribes de l'époque perse et hellénistique." RB, 68 (1961), 444.

[1] Frank M. Cross, "New Directions in the Study of Apocalyptic," in Robert W. Funk, ed., Apocalypticism, p. 159, note 3.

[2] Ibid., p. 163.

[3] Martin Hengel, Judentum und Hellenismus, WUNT, 10 (Tübingen: 1969), p. 375.

XUM

the casuistic distinctions of the scribes. Apocalyptic wisdom is to be distinguished from other forms in that it is based especially on revelations from God, and is given to a chosen few. The result of the combination of wisdom and prophecy was that "die grossen Männer der alten Zeit von Adam und Henoch bis zu den letzten Propheten zugleich als Propheten und Weise betrachtet (wurden)." He refers here to the 11 Q Psalm roll and its description of David, and Sir 44,3-5. His final comment is: "Die moderne Fragestellung, die die Apokalyptik einseitig aus der Weisheit oder der Prophetie ableiten will, wäre einem Ben-Sira oder den chasidischen Apokalyptikern kaum verständlich gewesen."[1]

Hengel here changes the terms of the discussion. Von Rad had argued that there was no direct connection between apocalyptic and prophetic tradition. Hengel argues that there was a direct connection between apocalyptic and prophetic consciousness. By "consciousness" he means here "inspiration," or better, perhaps, the expectation and the experience of direct divine revelation.[2] Would Von Rad disagree? His point about the lack of clarity in the idea of wisdom is not quite fair to Von Rad. Granted there were various meanings that wisdom could have at this period, Von Rad seems to be consistent in confining himself to the generally accepted works of Jewish wisdom.

For our purposes, the significant thing here is that Hengel accepts Von Rad's thesis that apocalyptic is rooted in wisdom, but with the reservation that it is rooted also in prophecy.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 376.

[2] Ibid., p. 369.

Summary

None of the critics have been able to say that Von Rad was completely wrong--that there is no connection between apocalyptic and wisdom. It appears that his arguments have demonstrated to their satisfaction that the connection is there. The questions that have been raised are these: Is apocalyptic rooted in wisdom, as Von Rad claims, or are wisdom characteristics merely coloring? and Assuming that it is so rooted, may it not also be rooted in something else (prophetic tradition or prophetic consciousness)? With both questions there is good reason, as we have seen, to incline toward Von Rad's side. Be that as it may, however, the important thing for our discussion is the fact that as a result of Von Rad's arguments the connection between wisdom and apocalyptic seems to have been accepted.

Historical Connection Among Sub-types

Our second question is: In what way is it possible to understand historically the connections among the Jewish, Christian and Neutral sub-types? That there is good reason for thinking that there are such connections has been shown in the common characteristics that we observed in the first two chapters, the broader connections indicated by Bousset-Gressman,[1] and recent studies indicating a connection of some kind between Jewish wisdom and gnosticism,[2] on the

---

[1] See Appendix II.

[2] All the Christian sub-type examples, with the possible exception of the Kasr Al-Wizz document, and NatArch and ParaShem of the Neutral sub-type are taken here, and are generally accepted as gnostic.

one hand,[1] and Jewish apocalyptic and gnosticism, on the other.[2]

But what could this connection have been, in regard specifically to our examples?

We will approach the problem by raising the question that Von Rad touched on but never completely answered, "über die Träger, die Kreise, in denen diese Vorstellungen (apocalyptic ideas) gepflegt wurden."[3] In a general way he answered it when he spoke of apocalyptic as being rooted in wisdom. But what does that say about the specific bearers and the specific circles that nurtured these ideas? It is not immediately clear, and Von Rad does not make any suggestions.

The Provenance of Daniel

Let us apply the question to Dan--the earliest of our examples. Who wrote Dan? What circle did he come from? Montgomery

---

[1] George W. MacRae, Some Elements of Jewish Apocalyptic and Mystical Tradition and their Relation to Gnostic Literature, Vol. I, 247-96. For his summary of this section see our Chapter II, p. 45, n. 1.

[2] Ibid., pp. 4-7, where a survey of the investigations in this area is given, and pp. 134-145; R. M. Grant, Gnosticism and Early Christianity, Harper Torchbooks (Revised ed.; New York: 1966), pp. 39-69; R. M. Grant, "Les êtres intermediaires dans le judaisme tardif," in Ugo Bianchi, The Origins of Gnosticism, Studies in the History of Religions (Supplements to Numen), XII (Leiden: 1967), pp. 141-60. For a comparison of the general Jewish tradition (Rabbinic and mystic, as well as the above) with gnosticism, see the remainder of MacRae, op. cit., and A. Böhlig, "Der jüdische Hintergrund in gnostischen Texten von Nag Hammadi," in his Mysterion und Wahrheit, AGSJU, VI (Leiden: 1968), pp. 80-101. See also the most helpful Forschungsbericht by H. J. W. Drijvers, "The Origins of Gnosticism as a Religious and Historical Problem," Nederlands Teologisck Tijdschrift, 22 (1968), 346-49.

[3] Von Rad, Theologie, Vol. II, p. 317.

expresses the opinion that is now generally accepted:

> Chapters 7-12 are an authentic monument of primitive Chasidism the Ἀσιδαῖοι of I Macc 2,42 and 7,13. Our book represents the principled pacifistic wing of the party. In (Dan) 11,34 there is a solitary reference to Judas' enterprise, "when they shall stumble, they shall be helped with a little help"; but there follows immediate criticism of the movement for its worldly complications, "many shall join themselves unto them in intrigue." The writer was nearer the primitive type of the party which preferred death to fighting on the Sabbath (I Macc 1,29ff), and he rejoices in the present martyrdoms in view of the prize that is set before them, 11,33 and 35, very much in the spirit of the early Christians. Not by militant means shall the tyrant be overthrown, but "he shall be broken without hand," i.e., without visible agency, 8,25, while the Saints shall inherit the Kingdom not by their might but by gift of the Highest, 7,27.[1]

The Hasidim--A Movement

Who were the Hasidim? What is known about their background? The word itself means "those who practice hesed (חסד)." According to Marvin Pope, hesed, when applied to man, means "man's ideal loyalty to God within the community of the faithful." Hasidim, then, could designate all the people of Israel as a religious community and is so used in Ps 85,8; 148,14; 149,1. But it also can have moral and spiritual implications as we see from Ps 37,28-29, and 97,10-11, where the word stands in parallelism to "the righteous" as opposed to "the wicked."[2] In both places the RSV translates hasidim as "saints."

Given the pre-Macabean religio-political situation,[3] then, the name itself suggests that the Hasidim were those who insisted on

---

[1] Montgomery, The Book of Daniel, p. 87. Similarly, Plöger, Das Buch Daniel, p. 30, and Russell, Jewish Apocalyptic, p. 16.

[2] M. H. Pope, "Hasidim," IDB, II, 528-29.

[3] I Macc 1,1-62 and Elias Bickerman, From Ezra to the last of the Maccabees (New York: 1962), pp. 102-111.

strict adherence to the Jewish traditions as contrasted with those who wanted to forsake the old ways for those of Hellenism.[1]

But what does I Macc tell us?

The passages mentioned by Montgomery are the only ones in which the name "Hasidim" is found in I Macc and are the earliest evidence for the existence of this group that we have. I Macc 2,42 says that a company of Hasidim (συναγωγὴ Ασιδαίων) joined Mattathias at the very beginning of the revolt, and that they were "mighty warriors of Israel, everyone who offered himself willingly for the law"; and I Macc 7,12-18 says that a group of scribes tried to make peace with Alcimus, whom Demetrius, Antiochus' successor, had named high priest (I Macc 7,9), and whom they thought to be in the line of Aaron (and therefore lawfully high priest, according to the Torah--Ex 29,9), but they were betrayed by him, and sixty of them were seized and killed. Vs. 13, in this passage, makes it clear that all the scribes were identified with the Hasidim and says that they--the Hasidim--were "the first among the sons of Israel to seek peace" from Alcimus and his Seleucid supporters.

Who, then, were the Hasidim? These two passages give the impression that they were a party within the anti-Hellenization movement. Mattathaias began the revolt--and then a company of Hasidim joined him. The Hasidim were "the first among the sons of Israel"--the assumption is that there were others among those sons.

To evaluate this impression we must try to understand to what extent these passages might have been influenced by the bias of the

---

[1] See particularly I Macc 1,11-13.

writer of I Macc.

He is generally thought to have been accurate in his reporting.[1] The author wrote during the closing years of the reign of John Hyrcanus (134-104 B.C.), and Brownlee suggests that "he wrote against the background of growing discontent of all Hasidic elements (including Pharisees and Essenes) with the Hasmonean leadership."[2] He notes also that according to Josephus "John's reign closed with an open rupture between him and the Pharisees and his espousal of the Sadducean cause."[3] If this was indeed the situation in which I Macc was written, then one can suspect that there would have been some advantage to the writer's cause[4] in his noting that a company of Hasidim joined Mattathaias (a Hasmonean) at the beginning of the revolt against Antiochus, and also in noting that the scribes who came to the High Priest Alcimus and were so badly used by this representative of the Aaronic high-priestly line (the Hasmoneans had taken over the high-priestly function from the Aaronic line[5]) were

---

[1] W. H. Brownlee, "The Books of Maccabees," IDB, III, 204; J. C. Dancy, A Commentary on I Maccabees, Blackwell's Theological Texts (Oxford: 1954), pp. 3-8.

[2] Brownlee, "The Books of Maccabees," IDB, III, 204.

[3] Ibid., p. 206; JosAnt XIII,10,5-6.

[4] Brownlee, Ibid., p. 205, refers to I Macc as "an official history of the Hasmonean house," and this is the position I have adopted here as being most consistent with the glorification of the Hasmonean line that we find in I Macc. R. H. Pfeiffer, however, goes to considerable lengths to maintain that this is not correct, but that the writer's real intention was to glorify Israel, not the Hasmoneans. (History of New Testament Times, With an Introduction to the Apocrypha (New York: 1949), pp. 491-96) However the glorification of the Hasmoneans, beginning with Judas Maccabeus, is too obvious in the text for his position to stand.

[5] N. Turner, "Hasmoneans," IDB, II, 530.

Hasidim.[1]

In contrast to the "party" view of the Hasidim that we find in I Macc is the position taken by II Macc. Here, in 14,6, Alcimus reports to King Demetrius that "those of the Jews who are called Hasidim, whose leader is Judas Maccabeus, are keeping up war and stirring up sedition." Here the Hasidim are the whole body of revolutionaries.[2] Although I Macc is generally considered more reliable than II Macc it seems likely that in this instance, in view of the probable bias of I Macc, II Macc is to be preferred.[3]

If this is so, it would be more in keeping with the meaning of the word hasidim. Mattathias and his sons were, after all, even more zealous than most about keeping the Torah. (I Macc 2,1-26) Why should they not have been called Hasidim too? And the call that Mattathias issued was to "everyone who is zealous for the law and supports the covenant . . ." (I Macc 2,27) Were not they Hasidim who responded?

---

[1] Note that there is a certain tension in each of these passages, suggesting some sort of editing. In 2,42 "everyone who offered himself willingly for the law" is placed in apposition to "a company of Hasidim." In 7,12-13 we hear first of the scribes, and then, rather awkwardly, of the Hasidim. The reader is left to make his own connection between them.

[2] Brownlee, IDB, III, p. 209, takes this passage in II Macc as a sign of Hasidic authorship, presumably with the idea that the Hasidim would have enhanced their position by being associated with Judas. However, all the indications are that II Macc was written in Egypt. (Ibid., pp. 209-10) It is not clear why it would have been important there (outside the political situation of Palestine) for such an association to have been made.

[3] For support for this see Eissfeldt, Introduction, p. 579. He holds, with others, that one cannot automatically assume that in every instance I Macc will be more reliable than II Macc.

It could well be then that the Hasidim at the time Dan was written were not a party within the anti-Hellenization movement, but that movement itself.[1] Certainly the term "hasidim" is appropriate when used to refer to the whole anti-Hellenization movement whether or not it was so used at the time, and it is in reference to that movement that we will use the term in the remainder of the chapter.

The Hasidim contained the Scribes

From I Macc 7,12-13 we have seen the scribes were identified as Hasidim.[2] Who were the scribes? They were a professional class made up of both priests and laymen who were responsible for teaching and interpreting the sacred traditions.[3] Sirach gives us a classic and undoubtedly idealized picture of the scribe in his period:[4]

39,1 . . . he who devotes himself to the study of the law of the Most High
will seek out the wisdom of all the ancients
and will be concerned with prophecies;
2 he will preserve the discourse of notable men
and penetrate the subtleties of parables;
3 he will seek out the hidden meanings of proverbs
and be at home with the obscurities of parables.
4 He will serve among great men and appear before rulers;
he will travel through the lands of foreign nations,
for he tests the good and evil among men.
5 He will set his heart to rise early to seek the Lord who made him,
and he will make supplication before the Most High;

---

[1] Similarly, Millar Burrows, The Dead Sea Scrolls (New York: 1955), p. 274. For bibliography on this question see Hengel, Judentum und Hellenismus, p. 319, note 438.

[2] See also Hengel, Judentum und Hellenismus, p. 147.

[3] Ibid., pp. 143-44; Matthew Black, "Scribes," IDB, IV, 246-48.

[4] Sirach was active around 190 B.C. Eissfeldt, Introduction, p. 597.

he will open his mouth in prayer and make supplication
for his sins.
6 If the great Lord is willing, he will be filled with the
spirit of understanding;
he will pour forth words of wisdom and give thanks
to the Lord in prayer.
7 He will direct his counsel and knowledge aright
and meditate on his secrets.
8 He will reveal instruction in his teaching,
and will glory in the law of the Lord's covenant.

Thus the scribes were a force for Jewish tradition in the pre-Maccabean period. (vss. 1 and 8) The tradition was not only the Torah, but also the prophets and wisdom. (vs. 1) Moreover, vs. 2 says that the scribes kept a collection (perhaps orally) of the teachings of wise men, and vs. 4, that they visited other countries with the apparent intention of becoming acquainted with their traditions so that they might test them against Jewish tradition.

The scribes, it appears, carried with them all the material needed for the Book of Daniel.

According to vss. 5 and 6 the scribes also learned how to approach the Lord in order to receive wisdom from Him. No doubt this meant that they would have accepted any ideas that they believed came as a result, no matter what the earthly source. Thus it is possible to understand the introduction of foreign ideas into a work--Dan--that sprang from those who were passionately dedicated to preserving the pure observance of Jewish traditions.

The scribes were the teachers of the people. Formerly they had taught the future priests and Levites, and perhaps wealthy laymen, such as the writer of Ecclesiastes. But Aboth 1,1 in the Mishna is good ground for believing that at some point in the period when Judaism in Palestine was exposed to the influence of Hellenism it was

XUM

decided by the leaders that the whole people had to be educated in the Torah and the other traditions of Judaism.[1] As far as we know only the scribes were prepared to carry out this work.[2] Thus the Hasidic movement--in the sense of those who were zealous for the law--in the time of Antiochus IV Epiphanes was very likely the creation of the scribes.

Fissiparous Tendencies

But this movement contained within it the seeds of division. How seriously was one to take the Torah-imbedded tradition that the line of Aaron was to possess the high priesthood forever? It appears that it was this issue that led the Essenes to separate themselves entirely from the rest of the Hasidim and retire to the region of the Dead Sea.[3] How open was one to be to the use of foreign ideas

---

[1] "Moses received the Law from Sinai and committed it to Joshua, and Joshua to the elders, and the elders to the Prophets; and the Prophets committed it to the men of the Great Synagogue. They said three things: Be deliberate in judgment, raise up many disciples, and make a fence about the law." The section of particular interest here is the one I have underlined. I follow Hengel, Judentum und Hellenismus, p. 146, and L. Finkelstein, The Pharisees, II (3rd ed.; Philadelphia: 1963), p. 580, in my understanding of the meaning and historical setting of this passage. Finkelstein suggests that the last phrase originally meant "strengthening the tradition as opposed to assimilation." The leaders of the time, he holds, "realized that Hellenism as a cultural movement could be offset only by a strong educational effort among the masses."

[2] Hengel, Judentum und Hellenismus, p. 146-47.

[3] Frank M. Cross, Jr., The Ancient Library of Qumran (Revised ed.; Garden City: 1961), pp. 128-41; G. Vermes, The Dead Sea Scrolls in English (reprinted (with revisions); Middlesex: 1968), p. 63; for the original connection between the Essenes and the Hasidim see Hengel, Judentum und Hellenismus, p. 319, where he demonstrates convincingly the derivation of the name "Essene" from "Hasidim"; Otto Betz, "Dead Sea Scrolls," IDB, I, 801.

XUM

in interpreting the Torah? It may be that this was the issue that originally divided the Sadducees and the Pharisees.[1] The passivism (not really "pacificism," as Montgomery has it, at least in the modern sense) in Dan has been generally observed by commentators. Dan describes the Maccabean rebellion as "a little help (11,34)," and his basic attitude seems to be that one should patiently endure until the consummation decreed by God. (12,1-4) If we contrast this attitude with I Macc 2,42, where a company of Hasidim are called "mighty warriors of Israel," we can see another serious division within the Hasidic movement. Some, depending on revelation, believed that all things were in the hands of God, and that one had only to remain pure to be saved in the eschatological judgment; while others disregarded the revelation, and believed that if they did not fight for their traditions, they and the nation would be destroyed. (I Macc 2,40) In Chapter II we noted that the writer of Dan appeared to be commenting disparagingly on the vision-interpretation kind of revelation.[2] It may be that behind this lay a difference of opinion with

---

[1] At a later time we know that one difference was over the resurrection--a foreign doctrine to the Sadducees. Acts 23,6-8 and Jos. War II,8,14. According to Acts they also disagreed on the matter of angels and spirit (πνεῦμα). Emile Schürer suggests that the Sadducees were not part of the anti-Hellenization movement. They were, he believes, descendents of the priests who were in favor of the Hellenizing reforms. They were worldly, whereas the Pharisees were the descendents of the pious Hasidim. (Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes in Zeitalter Jesu Christi, Band I (3rd and 4th ed.; Leipzig: 1901), 270.) However, this does not explain how it is that they were so concerned about issues having to do with interpretation of the law. Also, it would be as hard to believe that a party stemming from the Hellenizing movement could have grown up after the revolt, as to imagine that a party descending from the Torys could have been established in post-Revolutionary War America. Similarly, A. C. Sundberg, "Sadducees," IDB, IV, 162.

[2] pp. 52-53.

XUM

those who believed that one could pass by means of one's soul or spirit into the celestial and supercelestial regions, and there learn for oneself (with the help of a guide) the secrets of all things.

All this makes it clear that there were fissiparous tendencies within the Hasidic movement, and that some of these tendencies led to splits that we know about, because there are historical notices of one kind and another about them.

Unknown Splits

But what about the other tendencies that we have mentioned? May it not be that they too spawned splinter groups, which we have no record of?[1] The difference of opinion regarding the nature of revelation that we noted in Dan may have resulted in a group devoted to revelations by means of the ascension of the soul. It was perhaps such a group that produced Enoch xiv,8-xxxvi,4; xxxix,3-li,5; lii,1-lvii,3; the Apocalypse of Abraham, and was influential in the creation of Rev 4-22 and the Ascension of Isaiah, among others. It may also be that from such a group developed the interest in Merkabah mysticism, which Gershom Scholem has brought to the attention of scholars.[2]

And the circle that was responsible for Dan--might it not

---

[1] Hengel is convinced that such splintering occurred: "Sehr wahrscheinlich hat es ausser Essenern und Pharisäern noch weitere uns unbekannte pietistisch-konventikelhafte, aus den 'Chasidim' hervorgegangene Splittergruppen mit einer rigorosen Gesetzesauffassung und apokalyptischen Neigungen im nachmakkabaischen Judentum gegeben." (Judentum und Hellenismus, p. 327) See also the very suggestive second footnote on the same page.

[2] Gershom G. Scholem, Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism and Talmudic Tradition, New York: 1960.

also have separated itself from other groups and gone its own way? It is on the basis of this possibility that we can construct a hypothetical model of the way in which the sub-types of our Gattung might historically have been related to each other.

Hypothetical Model of Historical Connections

Any attempt to reconstruct history is an exercise in model-making. Since all the relevant happenings of even the most recent history seldom, if ever, are known, one can only approach a reconstruction by developing a pattern that will commend itself because it takes into consideration what happenings are known. But one always runs the risk of having left out of consideration some of the facts, or of being confronted with a rival model that likewise takes into consideration the known facts, but integrates them in a more intelligible way, or in a way that seems more currently useful. Thus all such models perforce have the character of a scientific hypothesis. The fewer the happenings that are known about the particular segment of history that is the object of study, the more obvious the hypothetical character of the model is. Such is the case here. There is, of course, a point at which one would not want to undertake an historical reconstruction, because the facts are too limited. However, in our case, there is enough information, I believe, to give the model I propose some measure of plausibility. Its value will be to provide a way of understanding the apparent historical connections between the sub-types of our Gattung, and it may also prove to be a small contribution toward answering the much discussed question of the origins of gnosticism.

The model pattern will be the familiar one of a tree and its branches.

Palestinian-Jewish Trunk

The main trunk, from its base, is the group that produced Dan, Jub,[1] amd ApocalBar. Its members believed in the way of revelation that we have seen in these three accounts. Based upon the character of the revelation sections, we can say that they also were concerned about the life of the Jewish nation--particularly that it should be regulated strictly according to the will of God as known in the Torah, and as revealed in their revelations; e.g., the calendar reform advocated in Jub. The disasters and near disasters that came upon the nation were interpreted as being the result of its failure to abide by the divine will.[2]

The trunk of our model is cut off just above ApocalBar: the nation is no more, and ApocalBar is the last example of this sub-type

---

[1] Eissfeldt, with good reason, dates Jub around 100 B.C. He also believes that it was written by the Qumran community. (Introduction, pp. 607-08) Russell, however, suggests that one should be cautious about such an identification if it is based (as seems to be the case with Eissfeldt) primarily on the correspondance of the solar year mandated in the Manual of Discipline and in Jub, since "these (calendrical ideas) were held by others at a date earlier than Jub and may well have been followed by parties within Judaism other than that of the Covenanters." (The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic, p. 54) Since the Qumran Community apparently was not involved in propaganda activity, preferring to hold itself aloof until the final consummation, it seems to me unlikely that it would have used a missionary or propaganda Gattung.

[2] Dan 9,4-19; Jub 1,5-14. In ApocalBar this belief is assumed, but the question is raised as to why the punishment (the destruction of Jerusalem) is so out of proportion with the sins of the people, and why others, who were not even attempting to keep the law have been punished much less, or not at all.

that is known.

Egyptian Branch

It may be that before the trunk was cut off branches grew from it, i.e., it may be that other groups separated from the parent group.

We note that the grandson of Ben Sirach went to Egypt in 132 B.C., and stayed there.[1] That he too was a scribe is suggested by the fact that he was concerned enough about the dissemination of wisdom to translate his grandfather's work into Greek. The fact of the translation also probably indicates that there was some interest in the study of wisdom among the Greek-speaking Jews of Egypt. That this interest was maintained is shown by the fact that the next piece of Jewish Wisdom literature is written in Alexandria in the following century.[2] It is quite possible, then, that scribes in the Daniel group also decided sometime in the last half of the second century B.C. to go to Egypt, and there found a receptive audience whose interest would have been continued through the years. Why would they have left Palestine? Perhaps they might have become disillusioned with the possibility of carrying out the strict reforms they favored with the Hasmoneans in power, and reached the conclusion that the Jewish nation could not be the true Israel. Perhaps there might have been an internal difference within the Daniel group.

The Jewish community in Alexandria, especially, was very

---

[1] Eissfeldt, Introduction, p. 597.

[2] The Wisdom of Solomon. See Eissfeldt, Introduction, p. 602.

large, and had a life of its own.[1] They and the other Jews in Egypt even had a temple that rivaled that of Jerusalem.[2] These facts, in addition to the possible reason for their leaving Palestine, mentioned above, make it unlikely that the members of an Egyptian branch would have continued seeking revelations about the life and fate of Palestine Judaism, as their Palestinian brothers did.

What might they have been concerned about? In addition to continued interest in the Torah and other Jewish traditions, which would be reasonable to expect, they would have been aware of the Iranian doctrines of the resurrection of the dead, and the final judgment, with the resulting everlasting life for some, and everlasting shame and contempt for others. (Dan 12,2) And in Alexandria they would have met the full force of Hellenistic individualism,[3] which meant concern for the fate of the individual, rather than the group. Combining these two things, one can suggest that they might well have turned their attention to the condition and fate of the human soul.

One can conjecture also that they would have come into contact with the concerns[4] and language of Greek Philosophy, which

---

[1] Pfeiffer, History of New Testament Times, pp. 172-78.

[2] Brownlee, "The Books of Maccabees," IDB, III, 210.

[3] W. W. Tarn, Hellenistic Civilisation, Meridian Books (3rd Edition revised; Cleveland: 1952), pp. 79-80. As regards the Jews specifically, see Ibid., p. 227.

[4] For the early period the philosophy would probably have been Stoic. "The Philosophy of the Hellenistic world was the Stoa; all else was secondary." (Ibid., p. 325.) Even the first century A.D. IV Maccabees is profoundly influenced by it. (Pfeiffer, History of New Testament Times, p. 219) For a brief but adequate review of

probably even at this time was exerting its influence among Alexandrian Jews,[1] which influence reached a climax in Philo. They would probably have felt it necessary to address themselves to those concerns, and to use the language that would make their statements understandable.

When all the above are taken together--the loss of interest in the life and fate of Palestinian Judaism, the new interest in the condition and fate of the human soul, and the concerns and language of Greek philosophy--we can see that these scribes might in effect have discarded the old hermeneutical principle for interpreting the scriptures, and provided for themselves a whole battery of new ones,[2] and the results would have been sanctioned by the belief that they (the results) were revealed by Wisdom.

It should be added that they might also have shared the interest of the writer of Wis in Sophia speculation. He writes:

> I will tell you what wisdom is and how she came to be
> and I will hide no secrets from you,
> but I will trace her course from the beginning of creation
> and make the knowledge of her clear
> and I will not pass by the truth . . . (6,22)

This mélange would account for the revelation sections that

Stoic concerns see Tarn, Hellenistic Civilization, pp. 331-35. With Philo, of course, the predominant influence was Plato. For the interests that this would have brought see Festugière, La Révélation, I, 17-18 and II, 92-94.

[1] A Jewish philosopher named Aristobolus apparently wrote during the second century B.C., although some have disputed this. See Pfeiffer, History of New Testament Times, p. 214-15.

[2] See Pfeiffer, History of New Testament Times, pp. 212-24; also Emile Bréhier, Les Idées philosophiques et religieuses de Philon d'Alexandrie, Etudes de Philosophie Médiévale, VII (3rd ed.; Paris: 1950), pp. 35-60.

we have in our Christian and Neutral sub-type examples, with the exception of the Kasr Al-Wizz document. We note that (1) all, with the exception of I ApocJas, use Gen (part of the Jewish tradition) as their exegetical Grundschrift,[1] (2) all are concerned about the fate of the soul, (3) all seem to have some interest in such Greek philosophical questions as the origin and ordering of the cosmos, (4) in most we find Greek philosophical language used, and (5) in most the figure of Sophia plays a significant role.

Because of the philosophical atmosphere, which continued at least through the time of Philo, it would not have been necessary to use our Gattung in order to commend speculative revelations to the interested public, so long as they were respectably philosophic. This would account for the form of Eug that Krause has posited as the earliest.[2] Under such circumstances similar treatises could have appeared[3] that subsequently could have become Christianized.

The Egyptian setting, which has been chosen here, agrees with the place of origin that critics have generally agreed upon for PSoph[4] and Poim.[5] I ApocJas has with good reason been identified

---

[1] This is true for Poim, as well. C. H. Dodd, The Bible and the Greeks (London: 1935), pp. 99-200.

[2] M. Krause, "Das literarische Verhältnis . . . ," Mullus, p. 222.

[3] M. Krause, "Der Stand der Veröffentlichung der Nag Hammadi Texte," in The Origins of Gnosticism, p. 75.

[4] Carl Schmidt, ed., Pistis Sophia (Hauniae: 1925), p. xxxii; G. R. S. Mead, Pistis Sophia (2nd ed.; London: 1955), xxvii-xxix; H.-C. Puech in Hennecke, Vol. I, 252.

[5] R. Reitzenstein, Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligion (3rd ed., 1927; Darmstadt: 1966), p. 47; Festugière, La Révélation,

by Böhlig as Valentinian.[1] Since Valentinus was an Egyptian and did the early part of his work in Egypt[2] it is reasonable to think that it may have originated there too. Although no detailed work has been done on the place of origin of ApocryJn and NatArch it is worth noting that in regard to the former, Puech states unequivocally that it was produced in Egypt,[3] and in regard to the latter, Bullard assumes that it too was written in Egypt.[4] No study has yet been given to the place of origin of the other five tractates that together with those mentioned make up the examples of the Christian and Neutral sub-types of our Gattung.

Christian Secondary Branch

With the coming of Christian missionaries to Egypt,[5] and the springing up of Christian congregations, this branch of the Dan trunk would have faced the same kind of problem that Palestinian-Jewish trunk had met in Palestine: How to approach a group oriented

---

Vol. I, 86; Dodd, Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel, p. 11. However H. Gundel considers that the Egyptian origin is still uncertain, while acknowledging that there are many reasons in favor of such a view. "Poimandres," PW, XXI, 1, cols. 1195-96.

[1] See Appendix I under "The First Apocalypse of James."

[2] Hans Lietzmann, A History of the Early Church, Vol. I, 287.

[3] Hennecke, Vol. I, 330.

[4] The Hypostasis of the Archons, p. 7.

[5] Nothing is known about the beginnings of Christianity in Egypt. (Hans Lietzmann, A History of the Early Church, Vol. I: The Beginnings of the Christian Church, trans. by Bertram Lee Woolf, Meridian Books (Cleveland: 1953), p. 132) I assume that missionary work would have begun sometime in the second half of the first century, but it could have been later.

toward the authority of individuals in matters of religion, to wit (in this case), Jesus, ultimately, and the apostles and their followers, secondarily, as his mediators. In order to commend their revelations to the Christians they might well have decided to put them in Christian guise,[1] to borrow Doresse's term.

Philosophically-Authority Oriented Pagan Branch

An Egyptian Jewish branch might also have had to deal with another problem in the latter part of the first, and into the second century A.D. How to approach pagans who were philosophically oriented, but who were caught up in that era's quest for knowledge by authority, rather than by reason.[2] Here it would not do to use traditions that were obviously Jewish or obviously Christian, since then there would have been danger of confusion because Jewish and Christian missionaries were also approaching the pagans. But terms could be used that were suggestive of an oriental background to good effect, as we noted at the end of the Chapter I. In this manner it is possible to account for the Neutral sub-type examples.[3]

---

[1] The rationale for using Christ as a wisdom figure is provided by Wis 7,27. Speaking of Wisdom, the writer says: "Though she is but one, she can do all things, and while remaining in herself, she renews all things; in every generation she passes into holy souls and makes them friends of God, and prophets."

[2] Festugière, La Révélation, I, 1-18.

[3] The Hermetic movement might be thought of as an off-shoot of this branch. This would be a good possibility if Reitzenstein were right about Poim being the first of the CH in time. However, as more recent commentators have noted, there is no way to be sure about this. See H. Gundel, "Poimandres," PW, XXI, 1, col. 1195.

Later Development

There remains the Kasr Al-Wizz document. With this, as we have mentioned in footnote 2 on page 4, are to be associated two other tractates that are similar, both in form and age. In all three the main cosmological revelation, which is, of course, the principal thing in all our other Christian and Neutral sub-type examples, is referred to but not given. Other matters, still having some cosmological significance, constitute the bulk of the revelation. In the Kasr Al-Wizz document, for example, it is the question of why Christ will bring the cross with him when he comes to judge. It is as though the main discourse in a tractate like ApocryJn was reduced to a few brief summary words, and one of the question-answer sections toward the end had been expanded and given center stage. Whether this ever in fact happened with the Kasr Al-Wizz document--whether it was at one time longer, including a full cosmological section--is something that may perhaps be able to be determined by future study of it and of the other, similar, tractates. In any case they attest to the fact that in the very late development of our Gattung groups made use of it for whom the issues that exercised so many in earlier centuries held little or no interest. But the signs of cosmology were not entirely erased, which perhaps testifies to the strength of tradition. And the Gattung remained a means of presenting speculations under the cloak of the highest authority.

To suggest an historical connection between these tractates and the earlier ones is not possible given the present state of our knowledge.

Summary

Our Gattung sprang from what was certainly one of the most dynamic periods in ancient religious history. Into the reactor of history were placed: the scribes, trained in the Torah, and other Jewish sacred traditions, instructed in the ways of wisdom, in touch with foreign traditions; their followers, many of whom were perhaps only the first or second generation that had been intensively educated in Jewish traditions; the attempt to reform along Hellenistic lines the whole life of the Jewish nation, including the religious life led by the high priests. The energy released in the reaction produced the Maccabean revolt, the Hasmonean dynasty, the Pharisees, who eventually became the molders of "normative" Judaism, the Sadducees, who for a long period were in many ways the effective leaders of the nation (from the reign of Archelaus--A.D. 4--to the Jewish revolt),[1] the Qumran community, and apocalyptic wisdom groups that have left behind literary remains, but apparently no history of their own. Our model is an attempt, one might say, to trace the paths of the energy particles that constituted the group that produced Dan. From Jerusalem to Alexandria; from concern for the life and fate of the nation, to concern for the life and fate of the individual and interest in the questions of Greek philosophy; from wisdom-philosophic treatises to the use of the wisdom missionary Gattung; from Egyptian-Jewish to Egyptian-Christian; from Egyptian-Jewish to philosophically-authority oriented pagan--these are the paths we traced in our hypothetical model.

---

[1] A.C. Sundberg, "Sadducees," IDB, IV, 161.

CHAPTER IV

CONNECTIONS BETWEEN THE GATTUNG AND THE NEW TESTAMENT

The final part of our task is to explore the possible connections between the Gattung that we have identified, and the New Testament.

Four passages will be considered because of strong resemblances they have with the Gattung: Mk 13,3-27, Matt 28,16-20, Acts 1,6-11, and Rev 1,8-3,22. The first three will be considered together in the first section, and the Rev passage, because of its special character, will be dealt with in the second.

Passages in the Gospels and Acts

We must begin by confessing frankly that this undertaking is very tentative indeed, for the following reasons:

1. The Gattung itself, in the sense of structure and Sitz im Leben together, is not found anywhere in the Gospels and Acts. The passages that we will be examining are closer to the structure of the Gattung than any other passages, but in none is the structure used to try to convince people of the truth of a revelation.

2. Even the structure of the Gattung is not found in a complete form in any of the passages we will be examining.

3. In each case, in order to speak of the influence of our Gattung, it will be necessary to hypothesize that examples of it

XUM

were in circulation. But this hypothesizing is unsupported by any known example. The Christian sub-type examples cannot be used here, since we have already said (and I believe rightly) that they depend upon the traditions found in the Gospels and Acts. Paul shows that material that would have been appropriate for the revelation section of the Gattung was circulating in the early church; e.g., I Thess 4, 13-5,11 and I Cor 15,20-28, 51-57. But there is no way to tell now whether the Gattung was originally used with this material. We might support this hypothesis by reference to the Dan group, assuming that members of it became Christians and subsequently produced revelations having to do with the life of the Christian community. There is a certain reasonableness that commends this, but the fact is that the continued existence of the Dan group is an hypothesis, and the assumption of a Christian off-shoot would then be a second-degree hypothesis. Thus if we tried to use this to support the possibility of the circulation of examples of our Gattung we would be doing no more than using two hypotheses to support one.

The only support of any value for this hypothesis, it seems to me, is the degree to which it seems to be required in order to explain the material that we find in the passages.

We will try to approach the three passages with the caution that the situation seems to warrant.

Mark 13,3-27

Mk 13,3-27 begins with Jesus and four disciples on the Mount of Olives. This is similar to most of the settings of the Christian sub-type examples, but for the reason that we have cited above in

number 3 it would be wrong to look for influence from that direction to account for it.

But it is not inappropriate to look elsewhere for an explanation of the setting. Some have suggested that it comes from Zech 14,4, where the Lord is said to stand on the Mount of Olives in the great day of judgment.[1] But there the Lord appears as the swift and violent dispenser of justice, and as part of the general upheaval, the mountain is split in two. That is quite different from the scene that we have before us in Mk, although admittedly the revelation itself does speak of violent happenings, and of the coming of the Son of Man--but not, it should be noted, of his judgment! It seems likely to me, then, that the mountain here is to be thought of in the same way as the mountain in Jub and ApocalBar, i.e., the place where one goes to receive a revelation from a divine being because it is closer than other places to the divine realm. There may be another factor here, too, that ought not to be overlooked. Toward the end of Chapter II we noted that Ben Sirach says that before he went on his travels, when he was still young, he sought wisdom before the Temple. (Sir 51, 13-14) We note that Mark is careful to say that the Mount of Olives is opposite the Temple.[2] Is it possible that what may have been an autobiographical detail for Ben Sirach was taken up by those who were influenced by his work and became a symbolic place for seeking wisdom?

---

[1] R. McL. Wilson, "Mark," Peake's Commentary, sec. 709 c.; E. Lohmeyer, Das Evangelium des Markus, Meyer Series (14th ed.; Göttingen: 1959), comments on Mark 13,3.

[2] As we noted earlier, Sir has the preposition ἐναντι, and Mark 13,3 has κατέναντι.

Whether the general feeling about mountains, or this specific idea about the place opposite the Temple or perhaps a combination of both, was operating here, in any case it seems likely that wisdom traditions were involved.

For our purposes the most striking thing about Mk 13,3-27 is that the apocalypse per se fits the description of the revelation section in our Gattung. It is a broad ranging survey of historical events leading up to the coming of the eschatological Son of Man from heaven. (13,5-27) The revelation is given in plain, clear language, and there are no visions or parables that veil the meaning. It differs from the examples of the Jewish sub-type in that the interest is not in the life and fate of the Jewish nation, but rather in that of the followers of Jesus, i.e., the church.

But this passage lacks two things that our Gattung has. Here the revealer is not a divine being, and there is no commission.

On the basis of the above observations, what can be said about the possible connections between this passage and our Gattung? Since the revelation section displays knowledge that could have been available only to a divine being,[1] and since the setting may well

---

[1] It is interesting that both J. Wellhausen and C. C. Torrey felt the inappropriateness of such a revelation in the mouth of one who is not a divine being. Commenting on this passage Wellhausen writes: ". . . Zur Form der richtigen jüdischen Apokalypsen gehört es, dass der Seher selbst, der die offenbarung empfängt, angeredet wird, sei es von Gott, sei es von einem Engel Gottes, oder dass er im Ich erzählt, was er hat schauen und hören dürfen." (Das Evangelium Marci (2nd ed.; Berlin: 1909), p. 100) Torrey writes "In the thirteenth chapter of Mark there is no indication of any special revelation, no mystery in the language (except in v. 14), none of the characteristic apparatus of the vision, nothing even to suggest knowledge received from heaven for the purpose at hand. Whatever may be thought of the material of the chapter, or conjectured as to its composition,

have been influenced by the traditions in Jub and ApocalBar, one can suggest that this passage may originally have been a tract in which the structure of our Gattung was used. It may have been produced by Christians who were influenced by the Dan group, and who claimed that they had received a revelation from the post-resurrection Jesus. This tract, then, could have been taken by Mark and adapted so that it could serve as the climax of the earthly teachings of Jesus. Alternatively, Mark himself might have constructed the whole passage patterning it after tracts that might have been in circulation at the time.[1]

Acts 1,6-11 and Matt 28,16-20

Both of these accounts occur after the resurrection, and therefore in both Jesus is to be thought of as a divine being. In both there are commissions. Both have the mountain motif. However in neither case is there a revelation that corresponds to the description of that section in our Gattung. In Matt 28 it is simply: "All authority in heaven and on earth has been given to me." (vs. 18) And in Acts 1 it consists of the statement: "It is not for you to know times or seasons which the Father has fixed by his own authority" (vs. 7), which is spoken in response to the request of the disciples that Jesus tell them if "at this time" he is going to restore the

---

there is nothing in any part of it that can justify the use of the term 'apocalyptic'." (Documents of the Primitive Church, p. 14f, quoted in G. R. Beasley-Murray, A Commentary on Mark Thirteen, (London: 1957), p. 17.)

[1] For a brief review of the source theories of Mk 13, see Wilson, "Mark," Peake's Commentary, sec. 709b.

kingdom to Israel.

The Acts statement is a refusal to give a revelation of the kind that would have fit the description of this section in our Gattung. Does this mean that we have here an example of the structure of our Gattung or not? It is hard to see how Acts 1,6-11 could have been written without the awareness of the kind of Gattung that we have identified. Thus we may not be far wrong if we say that Luke here takes the structure of the Gattung and uses it in order to have Jesus tell the disciples that they should not seek the kind of revelations ordinarily associated with the Gattung. Their business, he says in effect, is to receive the Holy Spirit and be witnesses.

In the background may be the kind of eschatologically fanatical group that we spoke about above. Perhaps it was teaching that there was no need to carry out missionary work so long as the Parousia was about to come. To this Luke would be saying an effective "no."

In regard to Matt 28,18, it is certainly not as clear as with Acts 1,7 that this presupposes the kind of revelation section found in our Gattung. Yet the statement of the Lord can be viewed as an alternative to the kind of knowledge normally found in examples of our Gattung. Matthew may be saying that rather than seeking knowledge about the future Christians should learn that all power has been given to Jesus--and that all they need do is trust him, and carry out the commission.

Revelation 1,8-3,22

In this section seven letters are dictated to be sent to the seven churches of Asia.

John, the recipient, is unknown outside Rev.[1] He prepares for the revelation by what appears to have been a kind of ecstatic experience. (1,10) He is commissioned to send the letters that are dictated to him to the churches. (1,11)

The speaker is described in terms similar to those used of the unnamed revealer in Dan 10-12.[2] Added is the notice that his hair is "white as white wool." (1,14) This undoubtedly refers to Dan 7,9, where it is part of the description of the Ancient of Days,[3] and is therefore meant here to signal the fact that the speaker is not only a wisdom figure, as the figure in Dan 10-12 is, but is also the divine judge. In 1,17-18 we learn unmistakably that he is Christ, and that in addition to being a wisdom figure, and the divine judge, he is also the divine savior.

The revelation section is in keeping with the three-fold character of the speaker. Since he is a wisdom figure, we expect him to display wide-ranging knowledge. At the beginning of each of the seven letters stand the words, "I know (οἶδα)." Five times it appears as "I know your works." Once it is "I know your tribulation," (2,9) and once "I know where you dwell." (2,13) Thus, the speaker knows what is going on in each of these churches, and what its situation is. Nothing is hidden from him. Admittedly, of course, this is a different kind of wisdom from that which we found in the examples

---

[1] W. G. Kümmel, ed., Introduction to the New Testament, trans. by A. J. Matill, Jr. (14th revised ed.; Nashville: 1966), p. 331.

[2] See N. Turner, "Revelation," Peake's Commentary, sec. 915d.

[3] Ibid.

of Chapter I. He is not telling the churches anything they do not already know. Rather the intention is quite the contrary: to assure them that everything that they know about themselves, he knows too. This is important because he is also judge and savior. In each case he either threatens judgment, or promises help and salvation, or does both, depending on the circumstances.

The intention in using this structure appears to have been to give authority to the words of assurance and warning. Thus it would not have been very different from the intention that we have suggested earlier for our Gattung.[1]

Here, then, it appears that a Christian prophet has taken our Gattung, modified it somewhat, and used it for his own purposes.

Summary

On the basis of the three passages from the Gospels and Acts, it is possible to suggest, but no more than that, that there may have been those in the early church who were influenced by the sort of approach to revelation that we identified in Chapters I and II. Further, based upon the kind of revelation that we find in Mk 13,5-27 (historical survey), and the question and reply in Acts 1,6-11 (concern about Israel and times and seasons), we can suggest that they would have taken their approach from the Jewish, Dan group, rather than being influenced by the branch group in Egypt. Mk 13,5-27 suggests that they would have quite naturally turned their attention away from

---

[1] The term we have used is "missionary" to describe the Gattung. This needs to be understood broadly here, as in the case indeed of the examples in the Jewish sub-type. It is not a question of converting someone of another religion, but of influencing someone of one's own.

concern about the life and fate of the Jewish nation, toward concern about the life and fate of the church. But this group would not have gone unchallenged. Luke seems to be turning against them in Acts 1,6-11, and Matthew may be doing the same thing in Matt 28,16-20. Matthew and Luke's interest seems to be away from apocalyptic speculation, and toward the work of the church in the world.

In Rev we see how the Gattung could be filled with new meanings. To do so it was stretched, almost to the breaking point. The revealer becomes also the judge and the savior. The revelation of knowledge is a revelation of what is already known, and is subordinated to the warnings and the promises.

One would not want to suggest that John was connected with any particular group. Obviously he was aware of Dan traditions. But Rev 4-22 shows that he was also aware of, and willing to make use of, the traditions of those who believed that one could secure knowledge by journeying into the heavenly regions.

CONCLUSION

We have presented here a previously unrecognized Gattung, and have named it a missionary wisdom Gattung. "Wisdom," because it seemed to display significant elements that we found in Jewish Wisdom literature, and because it seemed to reflect a "wisdom" approach to revelation. "Missionary," because our analysis led us to think that it had been used in order to persuade others of the authority of the revelations. Historically its first example came to light in the seething ferment of the Judaism of the Maccabean period. We were able to construct a hypothetical model to indicate how it might have developed from that point. Finally we investigated possible connections with the New Testament, with only tentative results in regard to the Gospels and Acts, but with more definite ones in regard to Rev.

The pressing next step for investigation in regard to this Gattung is the significance it has for the history of gnosticism.

APPENDIX I

DATES, PRINCIPAL EDITIONS AND TRANSLATIONS OF GATTUNG EXAMPLES

The Book of Daniel

Date

There is general agreement among scholars that the Book of Daniel was written in its present form around 165 B.C., during the time when Antiochus IV Epiphanes was seeking to force Hellenization upon the Jews, and when the more conservative Jews were resisting.[1]

Principal Edition and Translation

The principal edition used is in Rudolph Kittel, ed., Biblia Hebraica, 20th ed.; Stuttgart: 1949. The translation is that of the RSV.

The Book of Jubilees

Date

The dating of Jub has been much debated. Various scholars have suggested dates from the fifth century B.C. to 60 A.D.[2]

---

[1] O. Eissfeldt, The Old Testament: An Introduction, trans. by Peter R. Ackroyd (3rd ed.; New York: 1965), p. 521; Peake's Commentary, sec. 518c.

[2] Eissfeldt, The Old Testament, p. 608.

Eissfeldt convincingly dates it at about 100 B.C.[1]

Principal Edition and Translation

The translation used is that of Charles in his Pseudepigrapha, II, 1-82. It is based on the Ethiopic version. Fragments exist in other languages. The original Hebrew text is lost, with the exception of fragments found at Qumran. Charles provides information on the principal edition on p. 10.

The Apocalypse of Baruch (Syriac)

Date

Eissfeldt dates ApocalBar sometime in the first third of the second century, A.D. His reasoning is that it is dependent upon IV Esdras, which he dates about 100 A.D., and is quoted in Barnabas, written between 130 and 140 A.D.[2] Pfeiffer moves the date back to 90 A.D. because of an earlier date for Esdras.[3] I prefer the earlier date, at least for the section that we are dealing with, because the psychic wound of the fall of Jerusalem in 70 A.D. was still open and deep.

---

[1] Eissfeldt, The Old Testament, p. 608. He also holds that the book was written by the Qumran Community, on the grounds that it was used by them (fragments of it having been found among the Dead Sea Scrolls), and that there is a similarity of ideas (pp. 607-608). However, these by themselves do not prove authorship. But they do indicate a close connection between the Qumran Community and the writer of Jub.

[2] Eissfeldt, The Old Testament, p. 630.

[3] R. H. Pfeiffer, History of New Testament Times: With an Introduction to the Apocrypha (New York: 1949), p. 86.

Principal Edition and Translation

The translation used is that of Charles in his Pseudepigrapha, II, 470-526. The original was probably in either Aramaic or Hebrew.[1] It is preserved in its entirety only in a Syriac version. For information on the principal edition see Charles, Pseudepigrapha, II, 480.

The First Apocalypse of James

Date

The only date that can be given with any assurance as a terminus ad quem for 1 ApocJac, as well as for the other tractates that are part of the Nag Hammadi Library, is the date of the manuscripts themselves. It is now generally agreed that they are from sometime in the fourth century, A.D.[2]

As to the terminus a quo, we have, in this case, a section within the tractate that has been identified by A. Böhlig and H.-M. Schenke as Valentinian.[3] On this basis it is possible to say that the tractate in its present form can be no older than the time when Valentinus flourished--the middle third of the second century A.D.[4]

---

[1] Eissfeldt, The Old Testament, p. 630.

[2] James M. Robinson, "The Coptic Gnostic Library Today," NTS, XIV (April, 1968), 372.

[3] Alexander Böhlig and Pahor Labib, ed., Koptisch-gnostische Apokalypsen aus Codex V von Nag Hammadi im Koptischen Museum zu Alt-Kairo (Halle-Wittenberg: 1963), p. 33; H. M. Schenke, Review Article, OLZ, LXI (1966), col. 26-27. The section in question is the "catechism" from 33,5-36,14.

[4] H. Jonas, The Gnostic Religion (2nd ed. revised; Boston: 1963), p. 178.

Principal Edition and Translation

The principal edition is in Alexander Böhlig and Pahor Labib, Koptisch-gnostische Apokalypsen aus Codex V von Nag Hammadi im Koptischen Museum zu Alt-Kairo, Halle-Wittenberg: 1963. Any translation is my responsibility, although here, as elsewhere with Nag Hammadi materials, I have been helped by being able to refer to translations produced for the Coptic Gnostic Library Project of the Institute for Antiquity and Christianity.

Sophia of Jesus Christ

Date

Since this is found in the Nag Hammadi Library, the terminus ad quem is fourth century A.D. A papyrus fragment of the Greek version dated in the early fourth century has been identified[1] but this does not add much to our information. Puech suggests that SJC might have been composed in the second half of the second century, or at the latest the third century, but he gives no reasons for this view.[2] Nothing within the document itself suggests a date.

Principal Edition and Translation

We possess two copies of SJC. One is found in Codex III of the Nag Hammadi Library, and has been published only as footnotes in the edition of the other copy, that of BG 8502, edited by W. C. Till

---

[1] Poxy 1081, published in The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, Part IV, ed. Arthur S. Hunt (London: 1911), p. 16ff. Identification made by H.-Ch. Puech in Coptic Studies in Honor of W. E. Crum (Boston: 1950), p. 98, note 2.

[1] Hennecke, Vol. I, p. 248.

in his Die gnostischen Schriften des koptischen Papyrus Berolinensis 8502, TU 60, Berlin: 1955. My references are to, and my translations are of, the BG 8502 copy.

The Apocryphon of John

Date

For the terminus ad quem see my comments on the date of 1 Apoc Jas. The attempt made to establish an earlier terminus ad quem on the basis of the obvious similarity between the early part of the revelation of ApocryJn and IrenHer I,29[1] has not proved convincing because there is no way to establish that Irenaeus used ApocryJn as his source. It is just as possible that he and the author of ApocryJn used a common source, to which the latter added other material.[2] Another approach to a terminus ad quem is suggested by the analysis of Hans Jonas, who concludes that the system of thought in ApocryJn is very close to that of Valentinus. However he finds that it is "on a more primitive intellectual level in general, and in particular lacking those profundities of conception which constitute the unique originality of Valentinian thought."[3] It would be possible to suppose, then, that ApocryJn was one of the things that influenced Valentinus. Therefore, we might conclude, ApocryJn must at least be dated sometime before Valentinus'

---

[1]Carl Schmidt, "Irenaeus und seine Quelle in adv. haer. I, 29," Philotesia: Paul Kleinert zum LXX. Geburtstag dargebracht (Berlin: 1907), pp. 315-336.

[2]H. M. Schenke, "Nag Hammadi Studien I: Das literarische Problem des Apokryphon Johannis," Zeitschrift für Religions und Geistesgeschichte, XIV (1962), pp. 57-63.

[3]Jonas, The Gnostic Religion, p. 199. Puech comes to the same conclusion in Hennecke, Vol. I, p. 331.

mature work, i.e., sometime in the first third of the second century. This is the period to which Puech assigns it.[1] However, possible, and even probable this might seem, there is still the possibility that ApocryJn might represent a later, degenerate form of Valentinianism. But if this does not seem too strong a possibility, in view of the lesser likelihood that crudities would develop out of subtleties than that subtleties would develop out of crudities, we still are faced with the fact that the teaching section of ApocryJn may have existed by itself, before it received its present frame. Nothing in the argument from Jonas or Puech says anything about the frame. All of this means that we cannot, at present, give a terminus ad quem to the form of ApocryJn that exhibits our Gattung short of the date of the manuscripts themselves.

Principal Editions and Translations

There are two versions of ApocryJn, which are referred to as the longer and the shorter versions. Four copies of ApocryJn have now come to light. The short version is represented by the copies found in BG 8502, and CG III. The longer version is represented by copies found in CG II, and CG IV. The Gattung identification is not affected by the differences between the two versions.

W. C. Till has edited and translated the BG 8502 copy in BG 8502. The references in the dissertation are to this copy. The three CG copies have been edited and translated by Martin Krause and Pahor Labib in Die drei Versionen des Apokryphon des Johannes im Koptischen Museum zu Alt-Kairo, ADAIK, Kopt. Reihe 1; Wiesbaden: 1963. Søren

---

[1] Ibid., p. 330

Giversen has also edited and translated the text of CG II in Apocryphon Johannis. The Coptic Text of the Apocryphon Johannis in the Nag Hammadi Codex II with Translation, Introduction and Commentary, Acta Theologica Danica 5; Copenhagen: 1963. The translations in this dissertation are my own.

The Letter of Peter to Philip

Date

There is no obvious internal nor external evidence that permits the establishing of a date for this tractate, except that it is part of the Nag Hammadi Library, being found in Codex VIII.

Principal Edition and Translation

None have been published. Text and translation, edited and translated by Frederik Wisse, will be published in the Coptic Gnostic Library series of the Institute for Antiquity and Christianity

Pistis Sophia

Date

The generally accepted date, which there is no reason to question, for the composition of PSoph is sometime in the last half of the third century A.D.[1]

Principal Edition and Translations

The principal edition is Carl Schmidt, ed., Pistis Sophia, Coptica, II, Hauniae: 1925. This dissertation uses two translations.

---

[1] See Hennecke, Vol. I, p. 250.

For the convenience of the reader, Hennecke, Vol. I, has been used where it has a translation of PSoph, and the page numbers have been given for purposes of reference. In other places the translation of G. R. S. Mead has been used. (Pistis Sophia, London: 1955) In both cases the translations when quoted have been checked against Schmidt. The reader will note that in all cases I have given a "Schmidt" reference. These refer to the pages and line numbers in Schmidt's edition (not, however, to the manuscript line and page numbers). Where I have used Mead's translation, I have also given the old Schwartze-Petermann edition (S-P) page numbers. The reason is that Mead does not use Schmidt's reference system, but does show the S-P page numbers. However, since Mead does not indicate where the S-P lines begin and end, the page numbers stand alone.

For information on other translations, see Hennecke, Vol. I, 250.

The Kasr Al-Wizz Document

Date

This document was discovered late in 1965 on a salvage expedition conducted in Egyptian Nubia by the University of Chicago. Dr. George Scanlon, a research associate at the time at the Oriental Institute, made the discovery. In a University of Chicago press release (Jan 7, 1966) the manuscript is dated from the tenth or eleventh centuries A.D. The sign on its display at the Oriental Institute's Museum, however, says that "it is doubtful whether the original texts were composed before the fourth or fifth centuries A.D." The only indication of the basis for this is a reference to the Nag Hammadi library, some of whose tractates this one is said to resemble. But the

resemblance is in some ways quite remote, and therefore one would want to be very cautions about dating the document in this fashion. The documents most closely resembling this are The Books of the Institution of the Archangels Michael and Gabriel, which we have reviewed briefly in footnote 2 on p. 4. As we noted there, the first book is very tentatively dated by its editor between the fourth and sixth centuries, while all that can be said about the second is that it existed before the ninth century. Since the Kasr Al-Wizz document resembles them to some extent, it might have come into existence anytime from the fourth to the ninth centuries.

Principal Edition and Translation

A tentative translation appeared in the press release mentioned above. No definitive edition with transcription has appeared, although one is planned. The translations included in this dissertation were made by this writer from a transcription made by Professor James M. Robinson.

The Gospel of Mary

Date

The terminus ad quem of GMary is determined by an Oxyrhynchus papyrus fragment of the Greek original, which is dated in the early third century.[1] It was the opinion of the editor of the volume in which this fragment is published that GMary was in existence when Irenaeus was writing, i.e., that it goes back at least to the last

---

[1] C. H. Roberts, ed., Catalogue of the Greek and Latin Papyri in the John Rylands Library, III (Manchester: 1938), 18ff.

half of the second century A.D.[1]

Principal Edition and Translation

GMary is the first tractate in BG 8502, and has been edited and translated by Till in BG 8502. An English translation is found in Robert M. Grant, Gnosticism, a Source Book of Heretical Writings from the Early Christian Period, (New York: 1961), pp. 65-68. The first six pages of the tractate are missing. Pages 11-14 are missing also, but do not concern us since the section that seems to have our Gattung ends with 9,5.

The Nature of the Archons

Date

There is no obvious internal or external evidence that permits the establishing of a date. It is found in CG II.

Principal Edition and Translation

The text has been edited and translated by Roger Bullard in his Vanderbilt University dissertation, The Hypostasis of the Archons (1965). It is soon to be published. Although I have consulted Bullard's work, the translations of NatArch contained in this dissertation are my own.

The Paraphrase of Shem

Date

There is no obvious internal or external evidence that permits the establishing of a date. It is found in CG VII.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 19.

Principal Edition and Translation

None has been produced to the present time. Text and translation, edited and translated by Frederik Wisse, will be published in the Coptic Gnostic Library series of the Institute for Antiquity and Christianity.

Poimandres

Date

The scholarly concensus is that Poim is to be dated sometime in the second century A.D.[1] C. H. Dodd prefers a date quite early in that century.[2]

Principal Edition and Translation

The principal edition with French translation is found in A.D. Nock and A.-J. Festugière, Corpus Hermeticum, I (2nd ed.; Paris: 1960), 1-28. The translation that I have used is that of Frederick C. Grant in R. M. Grant, Gnosticism, a Source Book, pp. 211-19.

---

[1] H. Gundel, "Poimandres," PW, XXI, 1, col. 1195.

[2] C. H. Dodd, The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel (Cambridge: 1953), p. 12, note 2.

APPENDIX II

The following is taken from D. Wilhelm Bousset and Hugo Grossmann, Die Religion des Judentums in späthellenistischen Zeitalter, HNT 21, 4th edition; Tübingen: 1966. It is presented here because it is an early recognition of the connection among Jewish apocalyptic, gnostic, and hermetic thought and literature.

> Das religionsgeschichtliche Problem des späthellenistischen Judentums ist nur ein Teilproblem der allgemeinen hellenistischen Mischreligion, die man mit einem hässlichen Fremdwort "Synkretismus" zu nennen pflegt. Im besonderen aber gehört es mit zwei nahe verwandten Gebieten aufs engste zusammen, der gräko-ägyptischen Hermetik (und Alchimie) und der christlichen Gnosis. Denn alle drei haben denselben unliterarischen Charakter der Schriften niederer Volksschichten und wesentlich denselben Inhalt: Sittliche Unterweisungen wechseln mit naturwissenschaftlichen Belehrungen, namentlich astrologischer Art, und geheimnisvollen Orakeln; philosophische Gedanken, meist der volkstümlichen Allerweltsweisheit entlehnt, verbinden sich mit tiefstehendem Aberglauben und an die Zauberpraxis erinnernden Texten. Ueberall will man Wissen gewinnen, das durch Schauen vermittelt wird und auf göttlicher Offenbarung beruht; die Verfasser lösen sich von allem Irdischen, wandeln durch Himmel und Hölle und lassen sich durch himmlische Zwischenwesen belehren. Die Gottheit ist überall ins Transzendente vergeistigt und hält den Verkehr mit dieser Welt durch "Hypostasen" derselben Art und desselben Namens aufrecht: die Kräfte und Elemente, das Wort und der Geist, das Licht und die Weisheit, der Aion und die Aionen begegnen uns hier wie dort. Sie alle kennen dieselbe Gestalt des Erlösers, den "Menschen" (oder "Menschensohn"), der vom Himmel zur Erde oder Unterwelt herniedersteigt, um die Toten mit sich zur Höhe emporzuführen. Gewiss sind auch Unterschiede vorhanden: der jüdische Einschlag in die Apokalyptik, der gräko-agyptische in die Hermetik und der christliche in die Gnosis sollen und können natürlich nicht geleugnet werden; Kosmologie und Eschatologie, die in der Apokalyptik und in der Hermetik von grosser Bedeutung sind, treten in der Gnosis stark zurück, wenn sie auch nicht ganz fehlen. Aber eine Gestalt wie die des überall wiederkehrenden "Menschen" genügt zum Beweis dafür, dass es sich hier nicht nur um parallele, sondern um geschichtlich zusammenhängende Erscheinungen handelt. Alle drei sind Arme desselben Stromes einer Mischreligion, die vom zweiten vorchristlichen bis zum zweiten nachchristlichen Jahrhundert den vorderen Orient durchflutet.

Die Bedeutung des Judentums für die Gnosis erkennt man an deren antijüdischer Spitze, die gegen den Demiurgen Jao gerichtet ist. Die Verbindung der Hermetik mit der jüdischen Apokalyptik erhellt noch klarer aus der Gestalt Philos, der beiden angehört und auf dem Gebiete der Hermetik geradezu Führerdienste leistet. Während das Corpus hermeticum im allgemeinen erst aus dem 2. Jahrhundert n. Chr. stammt, ist Philo--nicht der Popanz Posidonius --der älteste sicher datierbare Zeuge für die Hermetik. In noch ältere Zeit (um 150 v. Chr.) führt wahrscheinlich die Apokalypse des Nechepso und des Petosiris, die "Astrologenbibel" genannt, die ihre astrologischen Offenbarungen durch Vermittlung des Asklepios von Hermes empfangen haben will. Es ist wohl kein Zufall dass uns die Mischreligion der hellenistischen Zeit zuerst und vor allem in der jüdischen Apokalyptik entgegentritt; die (hellenistenfreundlichen) Juden waren zwar nicht ihre Schöpfer, wohl aber ihre eifrigsten Verbreiter und Missionare. Sie waren der Sauerteig, der den Gärungsprozess in den Reilgionen der hellenistischen Kultur veranlasste und förderte. Diese weltgeschichtliche Bedeutung des Judentums ist allerdings von der Forschung noch nicht genügend erkannt und herausgearbeitet worden. (pp. 521-22)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

(The works listed below do not include those listed in the Preface under their short titles, or those listed in Appendix I.)

Barth, G., Bornkamm, G., and Held, H. J. Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew. Translated by Percy Scott. Philadelphia: 1963.

Beardslee, W. A. "James." IDB. Vol. II.

Beasley-Murry, G. R. Jesus and the Future. London: 1954.

_____. A Commentary on Mark Thirteen. London: 1957.

Betz, Otto. "Dead Sea Scrolls." IDB. Vol. I.

Bianchi, Ugo. The Origins of Gnosticism. Studies in the History of Religions (Supplements to Numen), Vol. XII. Leiden: 1967.

Bickerman, Elias. From Ezra to the Last of the Maccabees. New York: 1962.

Black, Matthew. "Scribe." IDB. Vol. IV.

_____, and Rowley, H. H. eds. Peake's Commentary on the Bible. London: 1963.

Böhlig, A. "Der jüdische Hintergrund in gnostischen Texten von Nag Hammadi," in his Mysterion und Wahrheit. Arbeiten zur Geschichte des späteren Judentums und des Urchristentums, VI. Leiden: 1968.

_____, and Labib, P., editors. Die koptisch-gnostische Schrift ohne Titel aus Codex II von Nag Hammadi. Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin Institut für Orientforschung, 58. Berlin: 1962.

Bonner, Campell. Studies in Magical Amulets--Chiefly Graeco-Egyptian. Ann Arbor: 1950.

Bousset, D. Wilhelm and Gressmann, Hugo. Die Religion des Judentums in späthellenistischen Zeitalter. HNT 21. 4th edition. Tübingen: 1966.

Bréhier, Émile. Les Idées philosophique et religieuses de Philon d'Alexandrie. Etudes de Philosophie Médiévale, VII. Paris: 1950.

Brownlee, W. H. "The Books of Maccabees." IDB. Vol. III.

Bullard, Roger A. The Hypostasis of the Archons. Vanderbilt University Dissertation, 1965.

Bultmann, R. The History of the Synoptic Tradition. Translated by John Marsh. 3rd revised ed. with supplement. Oxford: 1963.

Burrows, Millar. The Dead Sea Scrolls. New York: 1955.

Charles, R. H., ed. The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English. Vol. II: Pseudepigrapha. Oxford: 1913.

Conzelmann, H. The Theology of St. Luke. Translated by Geoffrey Buswell. 2nd ed. New York: 1960.

_____. Die Apostelgeschichte. 2nd ed. Handbuch zum Neuen Testament. Tübingen: 1963.

Cross, Frank M., Jr. The Ancient Library of Qumran. Revised ed. Garden City: 1961.

Dancy, J. C. A Commentary on I Maccabees. Blackwell's Theological Texts. Oxford: 1954.

Davies, W. D. The Sermon on the Mount. Cambridge: 1966.

Dibelius, M. From Tradition to Gospel. Translated by Bertram Lee Woolf. New York: n.d.

_____. Studies in the Acts of the Apostles. Translated by Mary Ling. New York: 1956.

Dodd, C. H. The Bible and the Greeks. London: 1935.

_____. The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel. Cambridge: 1953.

Doresse, Jean. The Secret Books of the Egyptian Gnostics. New York: 1960.

Drijvers, H. J. W. "The Origins of Gnosticism as a Religious and Historical Problem." Nederlands Teologisck Tijdschrift, 22 (1968), 321-51.

Duchesne-Guillemin, Jacques. The Hymns of Zarathustra. Boston: 1963.

XUM

Eissfeldt, Otto. The Old Testament: An Introduction. Translated by Peter R. Ackroyd. 3rd ed. New York: 1965.

Eliade, M. Patterns in Comparative Religion. Translated by Rosemary Sheed. Cleveland: 1958.

Festugière, Le R. P., O. P. La Révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste. Vol. I: L'Astrologie et Les Sciences Occultes. 3rd. ed. Paris: 1950.

_____. La Révélation d'Hermes Trismegiste. Vol. II: Le Dieu Cosmique. Paris: 1949.

Finkelstein, L. The Pharisees. Vol. II. 3rd edition. Philadelphia: 1963.

Frost, Stanley B. Old Testament Apocalyptic, Its Origins and Growth. London: 1952.

Gaster, Theodor H. The Dead Sea Scriptures. Revised and enlarged edition. Garden City: 1964.

Geffcken, J. Der Ausgang des griechisch-römischen Heidentums. 1920.

Georgi, Dieter. Characterization of Forms and Genre of New Testament Tradition. (Unpublished--mimeographed).

Grant, Robert M. Gnosticism, a Source Book of Heretical Writings from the Early Christian Period. New York: 1961

_____. Gnosticism and Early Christianity. Harper Torchbooks. Revised ed. New York: 1966.

_____. "Les êtres intermediaires dans le judaisme tardif." The Origins of Gnosticism.

Gundel, H. "Poimandres." PW, XXI, 1.

Guthrie, H. H., Jr. "Fast." IDB. Vol. II.

Haenchen, E. "Aufbau und Theologie des 'Poimandres.'" ZThK, 53 (1956), 149-91.

_____. Die Apostelgeschichte. 13th ed. Meyer Series. Göttingen: 1961.

Hengel, Martin. Judentum und Hellenismus. WUNT, 10. Tübingen: 1969.

Jonas, Hans. The Gnostic Religion. 2nd.ed., revised. Boston: 1963.

XUM

Koch, Klaus. The Growth of the Biblical Tradition: The Form-Critical Method. Translated by S. M. Cupitt. 2nd ed. New York: 1969.

Koester, Helmut. "One Jesus and Four Gospels." HTR, LXI (1968), pp. 203-247.

Kragerud, Alv. "Apocryphon Johannis, En formanalyse." Norsk Teologisk Tidsskrift, LXVI (1965), 15-38.

Krause, Martin. "Das literarische Verhältnis des Eugnostosbriefes zur Sophia Jesu Christi." Mullus, Festschrift Theodor Klauser. Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum, Erganzungsband I (1964), 215-223.

_____. "Der Stand der Veröffentlichung der Nag Hammadi Texte." The Origins of Gnosticism.

Kümmel, W. G., ed. Feine-Behm, Introduction to the New Testament. Translated by A. J. Mattill, Jr. 14th revised ed. Nashville: 1966.

Lentzen-Deis, Fritzleo. "Des Motiv der 'Himmelsoffnung' in verschiedenen Gattungen der Umweltliteratur des Neuen Testaments." Biblica, 50 (1969), 301-27.

Lietzmann, Hans. A History of the Early Church. Vol. I: The Beginnings of the Christian Church. Vol. II: The Founding of the Church Universal. Translated by Bertram Lee Woolf. Meridian Books. Cleveland: 1953.

Lohmeyer, E. Das Evangelium des Markus. 14th ed. Meyer Series. Göttingen: 1959.

MacRae, George W. Some Elements of Jewish Apocalyptic and Mystical Tradition and their Relation to Gnostic Literature. Vol. I. University of Cambridge Dissertation: 1966.

Malinine, M., et al. ed. Epistula Iacobi Apocrypha. Zürich: 1968.

Marcus, R. "The Name 'Poimandres.'" JNES, VIII (1949), 40-43.

May, Herbert G., and Metzger, Bruce M., ed. The Oxford Annotated Bible with the Apocrypha: Revised Standard Version. New York: 1965.

Mead, G. R. S. Pistis Sophia. 2nd edition. London: 1955.

Montgomery, James A. The Book of Daniel. ICC. Edinburgh: 1927.

Müller, C. Detlef G., ed. Die Bücher der Einsetzung der Erzengel Michael und Gabriel. Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium. Vols. 225 and 226. Scriptores Coptici. Tomi 31 and 32. Louvain: 1962.

XUM

Nestle, E., and Aland, K., ed. Novum Testamentum Graece. 25th ed., Stuttgart: 1963.

Petersen, Norman R. The Literary Problematic of the Apocryphon of John. Harvard dissertation: 1967.

Pfeiffer, Robert H. History of New Testament Times: With an Introduction to the Apocrypha. New York: 1949.

Plöger, Otto. Das Buch Daniel. KAT XVIII. Gerd Mohn: 1965.

_____. Theocracy and Eschatology. Translated by S. Rudman. Richmond: 1968.

Pope, Marvin H. "Hasidim." IDB. Vol. II.

Rahlfs, Alfred, ed. Septuaginta. 7th edition. Stuttgart: 1935.

Reitzenstein, Richard. Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligion. 3rd edition, 1927. Darmstadt: 1966.

Roberts, C. H., ed. Catalogue of the Greek and Latin Papyri in the John Rylands Library. III. Manchester: 1938.

Robinson, James M. "ΛΟΓΟΙ ΣΟΦΩΝ - zur Gattung der Sprachquelle Q." Zeit und Geschichte, ed. Erich Dinkler, Tübingen: 1964.

_____. "The Coptic Gnostic Library Today." New Testament Studies, XIV (April, 1968), 356-401.

Rowley, H. H. "Apocalyptic Literature." Peake's Commentary.

_____. The Relevance of Apocalyptic. New and revised edition. New York: 1964.

Rudolph, Kurt. "Der gnostische 'Dialog' als literarisches Genus." Probleme der Koptischen Literatur, Wissenschaftliche Beiträge. Halle-Wittenberg: 1968, pp. 85-107.

_____. "Gnosis und Gnostizismus, ein Forschungsbericht." Theol Rundschau. N. F. 34, Heft 2 (1969), 1-51.

Russell, D. S. The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic. Philadelphia: 1964.

Schenke, H. M. "Nag Hammadi Studien I: Das literarische Problem des Apokryphon Johannis." Zeitschrift für Religions- und Geistesgeschichte, XIV (1962), pp. 57-63.

_____. "Nag-Hammadi Studien II: Das System der Sophia Jesu Christi." Zeitschrift für Religions- und Geistesgeschichte, XIV (1962), 263-78.

XUM

_____. Review of Böhlig, Koptisch-gnostische Apokalypsen aus Codex V von Nag Hammadi. OLZ, LXI (1966), col. 23-34.

Schmidt, Carl. "Irenaeus und seine Quelle in adv. haer. I,29." Philotesia: Paul Kleinert zum LXX. Geburtstag dargebracht. Berlin: 1907, pp. 317-336.

_____, ed. Pistis Sophia. Coptica, II. Hauniae: 1925.

Schmidt, K. L. Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu. Originally published 1919. Darmstadt: 1964.

Scholem, Gershom G. Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism and Talmudic Tradition. New York: 1960.

Schürer, Emile. Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes in Zeitalter Jesu Christi, Band I. 3rd and 4th edition. Leipzig: 1901.

Scott, R. B. Y. Proverbs--Ecclesiastes. The Anchor Bible. Garden City: 1965.

Strugnell, J. "The Angelic Liturgy at Qumran---4Q Serek Sirot 'Olat Hassabbat." Congress Volume. Supplements to VT, VII (Leiden: 1960), 318-45.

Sundberg, A. C. "Sadducees." IDB. Vol. IV.

Tarn, W. W. Hellenistic Civilisation. Meridian Books. 3rd Edition, revised. Cleveland: 1952.

Taylor, V. The Gospel According to St. Mark. London: 1953.

Tournay, R. "Review Article of O. Plöger's Theocracy and Eschatology." RB, 68 (1961), 444-45.

van Unnik, W. D. Newly Discovered Gnostic Writings. Studies in Biblical Theology. Naperville: 1960.

Vermes, G. The Dead Sea Scrolls in English. Reprinted (with revisions). Middlesex: 1968.

Vielhauer, P. "Introduction to Apocalypses and Related Subjects." Hennecke, Vol. II.

Von Rad, G. Old Testament Theology. Vol. I: The Theology of Israel's Historical Traditions. Translated by D. M. G. Stalker. Edinburgh: 1962. Vol. II: The Theology of Israel's Prophetic Traditions. Translated by D. M. G. Stalker. Edinburgh: 1965.

_____. Theologie des alten Testaments, Band II: Die Theologie der prophetischen Ueberlieferungen Israels. 5th Auflage. München: 1968.

XUM

Wellhausen, J. Das Evangelium Marci. 2nd ed. Berlin: 1909.

Whybray, R. N. Wisdom in Proverbs. Studies in Biblical Theology. Naperville: 1965.

Widengren, G. "Les origines du gnosticisme et l'histoire des religions." The Origin of Gnosticism.

Wilson, R. McL. "Mark." Peake's Commentary.

Winston, David. "The Iranian Component in the Bible." History of Religions, 5 (1966), 183-216.